

Capt. Walter J. Buttgenbach, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Charles O. Schudt, Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be major with rank from January 26, 1918.*

Capt. Marcellus H. Thompson, Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be majors with rank from January 28, 1918.*

Capt. William W. Rose, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Albert Gilmor, Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be majors with rank from January 30, 1918.*

Capt. Clarence A. Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. William P. Currier, Coast Artillery Corps (Quartermaster Corps).

Capt. Horace F. Spurgin, Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be majors with rank from January 31, 1918.*

Capt. Edward A. Brown, Coast Artillery Corps (Quartermaster Corps).

Capt. John G. Donovan, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Guy L. Gearhart, Coast Artillery Corps (Aviation Section, Signal Corps).

Capt. Allen Kimberly, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Geoffrey Bartlett, Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be major with rank from February 1, 1918.*

Capt. William E. Shedd, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be majors with rank from February 5, 1918.*

Capt. Robert Arthur, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. William P. Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be captain with rank from December 22, 1917.*

First Lieut. Ross G. Hoyt, Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be captain with rank from December 23, 1917.*

First Lieut. William Mayer, Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be captain with rank from December 24, 1917.*

First Lieut. Hubert A. McMorro, Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be captain with rank from December 25, 1917.*

First Lieut. Douglas G. Clark, Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be captains with rank from December 26, 1917.*

First Lieut. Vernon G. Cox, Coast Artillery Corps.

First Lieut. Ralph G. Lockett, Coast Artillery Corps.

*To be captain with rank from December 29, 1917.*

First Lieut. William F. Lafrenz, Coast Artillery Corps.

NOTE.—This message is submitted for the purpose of correcting errors in the dates of rank of the nominees. These officers were nominated to the Senate January 31, 1918, and confirmed by that body February 13, 1918.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 26, 1918.*

##### RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Scott White to be receiver of public moneys at Phoenix, Ariz.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

John J. Bradley to be United States marshal northern district of Illinois.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 26, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, Almighty God our Heavenly Father, for all the good, the generous, the pure, the noble, the brave, the great, whom Thou hast from time to time raised up, who by devotion to duty and the rectitude of their behavior left the world better than they lived and wrought.

By devotion to our duty, in the spirit of emulation, help us to leave behind us a record worthy of emulation by those who shall come after us; in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

##### SOUTH DAKOTA'S RATIFICATION OF PROHIBITION AMENDMENT.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, South Dakota has ratified the proposed constitutional amendment for prohibition. I send to the Clerk's desk a certified copy of the proceedings.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

##### Certificate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

I, Frank M. Rood, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the annexed senate joint resolution No. 1 was duly passed by the 1918 special session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, March 22, 1918.

FRANK M. ROOD,  
Secretary of State.

A joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the manufacture, sale, and transportation of intoxicating liquors.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States as provided by the Constitution:

##### "ARTICLE —.

"SECTION 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring:

SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded to the governor of this State, to the Secretary of State at Washington, to the presiding officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

A. C. ROBERTS,  
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

CHAS. M. GARDNER,  
Chief Clerk.  
W. H. MCMASTER,  
President of the Senate.

Attest:

W. N. VAN CAMP,  
Secretary of the Senate.  
W. N. VAN CAMP,  
Secretary of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within act originated in the senate, and was known in the senate files as senate joint resolution No. 1.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
Office of secretary of state, ss:  
Filed March 22, 1918, at 3.40 o'clock p. m.

FRANK M. ROOD,  
Secretary of State.  
By GEO. F. SAYERS,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, when South Dakota was admitted into the Union in 1889, when her constitution was submitted to the people for ratification at the general election on October 1 of that year, a separate provision for prohibition was submitted at the same time. At that election there were 40,234 votes in favor of the constitutional provision for prohibition and 34,510 votes against it.

In 1895 the Legislature of South Dakota submitted to the people of the State a proposed repeal of this constitutional provision, and at the general election in 1896 the vote for repeal stood 31,901 for it and 24,910 against it. In 1916 an amendment for prohibition was again submitted to the electors of the State, and the vote at that general election was 65,334 in favor of prohibition and 53,380 against it. The legislature met in January, 1917, and enacted a bone-dry law, which went into effect on July 1, 1917. That law has been vigorously enforced, and it has been violated only in few instances.

Recently the Legislature of South Dakota convened in special session and by unanimous vote of both Houses, not a single vote being cast against it, ratified the Federal prohibition amendment. I take some pride and satisfaction in the record made by my State. [Applause.]

##### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment

of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 389) to extend the time for cutting timber on the Coconino and Tusayan National Forests, Ariz.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the bill (H. R. 9867) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3426. An act to empower the President to requisition, for war purposes, timber and timber products, rights of way, and logging equipment; to construct and operate logging roads and saw-mills; and fixing a penalty for the violation thereof.

#### ARMS AND AMMUNITION.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Record a speech delivered by me before the Union League Club in New York some 10 days ago on the subject of arms and ammunition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a speech that he delivered before the Union League Club about 10 days ago on the subject of arms and ammunition. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### FOURTH-CLASS POST OFFICES.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I offered an amendment to the postal employees' salary bill, which was intended for the relief of post offices of the fourth class that had been made central accounting offices. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], in opposing that amendment, made the statement that there were no fourth-class post offices that were central accounting offices. I disputed that statement at the time. Of course, it is too late now to correct whatever adverse effect the gentleman's statement may have had upon my amendment, which, of course, was very great because of his prestige as a member of the Post Office Committee and as an expert on these questions; but in the interest of accuracy I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that upon inquiry at the office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department I find that there are 196 fourth-class offices that are now central accounting offices; that 21 of these are in Kentucky alone, and 5 in my own district, as I stated yesterday. I have discovered that there is even one in the gentleman's own State of Illinois, in Elizabethtown, Hardin County.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. And there are 40,000 fourth-class post offices.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not question that; but the gentleman said there were no fourth-class post offices that were central accounting offices, and yet the records of the department show that there are 196 of them.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, it was not the intention to have any; I knew that.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman was simply mistaken. Inasmuch as he now seems willing to concede that I was right and he was wrong, I believe that is all I want to say.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Young, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 9352) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of War," approved March 5, 1890, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. WARREN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 389. An act to extend the time for cutting timber on the Coconino and Tusayan National Forests, Ariz.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 9571. An act to authorize the appointment of officers of the Philippine Scouts as officers in the militia or other locally created armed forces of the Philippine Islands drafted into the service of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9903. An act to provide for restoration to their former grades of enlisted men discharged to accept commissions, and for other purposes.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCIES.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the urgent deficiency bill (H. R. 9867).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, this is a most important report. There have been one or two changes in the early part of the bill, made, I understand, chiefly as a result of the labors and ability of the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations [Mr. SHERLEY]. I think there ought to be a quorum here during the consideration of it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of no quorum present.

Mr. SHERLEY. Personally I hope the gentleman will not insist on the point. I think there will be plenty of Members in attendance here before we are through with the consideration of the report.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw his motion?

Mr. WALSH. I dislike very much to disagree with the distinguished gentleman, but I think there should be a more full attendance in the House.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum.

Mr. SHERLEY. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Fordney	Key, Ohio	Rowland
Blackmon	Gandy	Kreider	Schall
Borland	Gard	LaGuardia	Scott, Pa.
Caldwell	Good	Lenroot	Scully
Chandler, N. Y.	Goodall	Littlepage	Smith, Chas. B.
Church	Gould	McCulloch	Smith, Thos. F.
Classon	Graham, Pa.	Mann	Stephens, Nebr.
Cooper, Ohio	Gregg	Mason	Templeton
Copley	Hamill	Miller, Minn.	Thomas
Curry, Cal.	Harrison, Miss.	Miller, Wash.	Tinkham
Davidson	Harrison, Va.	Mott	Van Dyke
Dent	Hayes	Overmyer	Vare
Dies	Helntz	Pou	Ward
Drukker	Hollingsworth	Powers	Wood, Ind.
Eagle	Johnson, S. Dak.	Price	
Fairchild, G. W.	Kahn	Riordan	
Flood	Kehoe	Roberts	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the conferees.

[For conference report and statement see proceedings of Saturday, March 23, 1918, pp. 3967 to 3971.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the urgent deficiency bill as it passed the House carried a total of \$687,830,482.46 of cash appropriations and authorizations of \$419,339,000. As it passed the Senate it carried in direct appropriations \$761,780,912.20 and the same amount of authorizations, or an increase in the bill of \$73,950,449.74. As it came out of conference there had been a recession on the part of the Senate of \$30,079,142.74 and a recession on the part of the House of \$43,871,307, so that the bill now carries \$731,901,789.46. The reason for the addition of \$43,000,000 over the bill as it passed the House was due, not simply to increases in items that had been passed upon by the House but to the fact that estimates of considerable size came to the Congress after the hearings had been closed and too late to be considered by the House committee; and those estimates were very properly taken to the Senate committee and there considered and some of them allowed, some of them rejected. It resulted from that that there were added matters by the Senate which had not been passed upon by the House and that the increases were not of the ordinary kind representing increases in matters upon which the House had expressed judgment. That was true of nearly all of the \$73,000,000 that were added. The Senate made few changes in matters that had been considered by the House, and of the \$73,000,000 they added they sub-



sequently receded from some \$30,000,000. So much for the general financial statement.

There were placed by the Senate upon the bill two provisions of first importance—provisions of legislation that the House should be fully advised of. One of them provided for the purchase by the Government of the Hoboken docks owned by the Hamburg-American and North German Lloyd Steamship Cos., German companies, the title to these properties, however, being held by two American corporations, the stock of which, however, is all German owned.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I prefer to make a general statement touching these matters and then I shall yield to inquiries. There was also a provision added which enlarged the scope of the power of the Alien Property Custodian. Under the law as it passed the Congress touching alien property the Alien Property Custodian was given the custody of such property for management and control, but with the right to sell only in order to prevent waste, that limitation having been put into the bill in conference and not having been in the bill as it passed through the House or the Senate. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, upon representations made by the Alien Property Custodian, reported a provision authorizing the Alien Property Custodian to sell any property of aliens that came into his possession, the same as if he were the absolute owner thereof, provision, of course, being made for the turning of the moneys into the Treasury of the United States. When the bill reached the floor of the Senate there was added an amendment, upon the motion of the Senator from New Jersey, in the way of a proviso, which required that all property sold by the Alien Property Custodian should be sold to American citizens at public auction to the highest bidder. That amendment was adopted by the Senate, and the provision in that form came to the House and subsequently went to conference. The House conferees agreed to the amendment of the Senate touching the right of the United States to buy the properties at Hoboken, the change made being largely a change in form and not in substance. The Senate amendment as it passed the Senate provided that the President might buy these properties, and further provided that if the price could not be agreed upon that 75 per cent of the value fixed by the President as just compensation might be paid to the person entitled to receive the same, and such person should have the right, having declined to accept the full amount, to sue for such additional sum as he felt entitled to. In other words, the same provision was inserted in the Senate amendment touching the payment of the purchase price of this property as had been provided in connection with property taken by the Government from American citizens, but it did not seem to the House conferees that there was any reason for such a provision under these particular circumstances. We were providing in the second amendment for the right of the Alien Property Custodian to sell any property held by him, and we were providing in the first amendment for the right of the United States Government to buy these particular properties. It did not seem either necessary or desirable to make a distinction between the situation that would arise when the Government bought and when a private person bought. If any private person buys property from the Alien Property Custodian, he simply pays the money to the Alien Property Custodian, and it is then held subject to such disposition as may be arrived at at the end of the war. There was no reason for authorizing suit against the Federal Government touching the price that should be paid.

If the person authorized to sue in the Senate amendment meant the Alien Property Custodian, there was no reason to have him sue the Federal Government. If it meant the German owners of the property, there was a very great reason why they should not be permitted to sue the Government, because it would result that the Government would put itself in the position where it would be bound by the judgment of its own courts and yet the other party to the suit would not be bound, and the final disposition of the moneys that come from the sale of alien property in America will have to be settled at the council table when peace shall come between the warring nations. There was no wisdom in such a provision. The House conferees therefore insisted that the first amendment should simply carry the right to the President to buy, and the Senate acquiesced in that viewpoint. When it came to the second amendment, the provision as it had passed the Senate, while doubtless intended to safeguard the disposition of this property, might have, and in many instances would have, resulted in transferring the property back into the hands of the very people that we desired to take it from, because by having an absolute requirement that the sale must be made to American citizens at public auction to the highest bidder, in many instances it meant that the minority interests, American in name

only, would have been the actual purchasers, and the property would really be held in the future, as in the past, for Germany. No greater blow and no more legitimate blow can be struck in this country against our enemy, Germany, than by depriving her of the industrial control that she had through ownership of many corporations and many industries in America. [Applause.] And we would be lacking in ordinary common sense, to say nothing of patriotism, if we did not provide for a separation of these German citizens from control in great industrial matters. A recital could be made, taking hours, showing instance after instance where the German control of industries in this country is great enough to have very far-reaching influence upon the life and the trade of this country. Now, we all of us recognized the need of ending that commercial influence and control. We also recognized the desirability of safeguarding, so far as it can be done, the disposition of this property, which runs into the hundreds of millions, having in mind the major purpose of the legislation, and that presented the real problem to the conference, a problem that was not entirely easy of solution. We present to you the report in the belief that it has been intelligently solved. We provide that when the property is sold it shall be sold at public sale, after public advertisement, where the property or the major portion of it is situated, to the highest bidder who shall be an American citizen. That is the broad rule that we lay down as being the policy that ought to be and shall be followed in all these cases where there is not some compelling reason otherwise. But, having laid down that general principle, we provide that the President, for reasons stated, shall have the right to order the disposition of this property by private sale or otherwise—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. In a moment. And we further provide that after the sale has been made the Alien Property Custodian may upon order of the President set aside such sale for reasons stated, and subsequently the property may be sold by public sale or otherwise, as the President may direct. In other words, we state as the judgment of the Congress that the property, unless there be special reasons to the contrary, when sold, shall be publicly sold, but we give to the President the power in the interest of the Nation to declare that it shall be disposed of otherwise when in his judgment it is necessary so to do in order to protect national interests. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I wanted to ask the gentleman about the cases referred to—the sale of the Hamburg docks.

Mr. SHERLEY. I should have stated that where the sale is to the United States Government it does not require that it be a public sale.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It can negotiate directly?

Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably; and manifestly where the Government is to buy there is no reason why there should be a requirement of a public sale, when the Government would be compelled to bid against others in order to acquire property it might need and does need for war purposes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The first amendment relates exclusively to the taking over of the docks, piers, warehouses, wharves, and terminal equipment and facilities on the Hudson River now owned by the North German Lloyd Dock Co. and the Hamburg-American Terminal & Navigation Co., two corporations of the State of New Jersey, and so forth. The second amendment relates to the trading-with-the-enemy act, approved last October.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That relates to the Alien Property Custodian and what he may or may not do with property of which he is the custodian.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; it changes existing law in this particular, that under existing law he is permitted to sell property to prevent waste, and under the amendment as agreed to he is permitted to sell property as if he were the absolute owner—in other words, to sell any property that comes into his hands, but to sell it in the manner provided.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, would the Alien Property Custodian under that second amendment have the power to sell these Hamburg docks?

Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably. He has them in his possession and control and has had them for months.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I call attention to this language of the first amendment:

That if any such property—

That is, docks, wharves, and so forth—

shall be taken over as aforesaid, the United States shall make just compensation therefor, to be determined by the President.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. "Upon the taking over of said property by the President, as aforesaid, the title for all such property so taken over shall immediately vest in the United States."

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, can that property be sold to the United States if it already has a vested title?

Mr. SHERLEY. Because the gentleman does not make a distinction between the title the Alien Property Custodian has under the law and the title the United States will get under purchase. The Alien Property Custodian under the law that we passed is authorized and directed to take over alien property which he holds as a common-law trustee.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I understand.

Mr. SHERLEY. Without a fee title to it; but under this, when the President shall have bought this property and taken it over, the fee-simple title in that property vests in the United States Government.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, if that is so, that the fee-simple title is in the United States immediately upon taking over property by the President under the provisions of the first section, how can the Alien Property Custodian under the provisions of the second amendment sell property to the United States to which it already has fee-simple title?

Mr. SHERLEY. Except that you make a premise that does not exist. The Alien Property Custodian has not the fee-simple title now.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The United States has.

Mr. SHERLEY. The United States has not. It is in these corporations. The control of the property is in the Alien Property Custodian. Under the second amendment, as such custodian he has the right to sell as if he were the absolute owner, and he does sell to the United States, which under the first amendment is authorized to buy and, when it buys, get a fee-simple title.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I confess I do not exactly understand that myself.

Mr. SHERLEY. I assure the gentleman that the matter has not been dealt with blindly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I presume it has not.

Mr. SHERLEY. It has not been done without regard to the questions of law involved.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the Alien Property Custodian under the provisions of the law approved last October, known as the "trading-with-the-enemy" act, already has the custody of those docks, wharves, and so forth, and under the second amendment already has the power to sell to the United States, why was it necessary to have this first amendment, authorizing the President to take it and secure at once the fee-simple title?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, it was thought desirable to expressly authorize the President to acquire these particular properties. The second amendment is very much more far-reaching and wider than the first.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, I know; but if he already has the power to sell it to the United States there was no reason whatever for giving to the President the power to take the fee-simple title right off himself.

Mr. SHERLEY. He does not take the fee-simple title right off himself. He gets it when he shall have acquired the property, either by concrete sale by the Alien Property Custodian or by taking the property and making just compensation therefor.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The language of the first amendment is this:

*Provided, That if such property can not be procured by purchase, then the President is authorized and empowered to take over for the United States the immediate possession and title thereof—*

*Without any regard to the custodian.*

Mr. SHERLEY. Suppose we do. When we have allowed him to take the property of American citizens when he needed to, shall we refuse to give him the power to take the property of alien enemies of the country? [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not see why gentlemen are applauding anything except the emphasis the gentleman gave to his reply. It did not meet the point I have made here.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will make his inquiries in my time instead of commenting upon my answers, perhaps I can satisfy him.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I did not comment upon the answer. I commented upon the applause. I made no comment upon the answer.

Mr. SHERLEY. All right.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It was very eloquent, indeed, and I thought not entirely responsive.

Mr. SHERLEY. That explains the applause.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, then, the point I wish specifically to make is this: The first amendment in express terms authorizes the President, without any regard to the custodian, to take over that property, the immediate possession or title thereof, and when he does that, instantly, by the provisions of the same amendment, the title to that property is absolutely vested in the United States. And yet in the second paragraph they say that the Alien Property Custodian can proceed to sell that to any person that he pleases. It seemed to me upon the face of the two provisions that there was a contradiction. That is all.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. WALSH. In reference to the last query propounded by the gentleman, of course, where property is specifically mentioned in the first section, any other legislation of a general character would not annul the specific legislation.

Mr. SHERLEY. But it is inconceivable that an Alien Property Custodian, the appointee of the President, controlled by him, would undertake to dispose of property to somebody other than the Government of the United States when the Congress of the United States says that it will be bought by the President for the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Now, may I ask the gentleman under what conditions, if he feels it is proper to state, would it properly arise whereby the President might decree that in the public interest the property should not be sold at public sale?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer the gentleman without undertaking to name specific cases, though I think they could be named. Here is a certain industry owned 10 per cent, or 20 per cent, or 30 per cent by naturalized American citizens, with 60 or 70 or 80 per cent owned by German citizens, all of the capital in the first instance having been practically German. That minority interest might, and in many instances probably would, be in a position to bid most for the property, knowing both its value and also being practically bidding for the interests that were there in the first instance. The purchaser would be technically an American citizen, and yet his money come from and his heart be in Germany. We have scriptural warrant for the saying that where a man's treasure is there is his heart also. In such a case it would be in Germany and not in the United States. It might be highly desirable that the sale should not be permitted to go to such minority interest.

There is even another case that is conceivable that is not related to the question of aliens and alien enemies. There might be a purchase of some of these corporations which represent great dominant influences in certain trades by their large rivals in business that would give to them, if they got possession of the property, a complete monopoly, and it might not be desirable in the interest of the public that that should occur.

There is in this morning's paper a statement touching an alien-enemy corporation owning large sugar properties in the Hawaiian Islands, and the statement—I do not know how accurate it may be—is to the effect that an effort had been made, which was circumvented by the Alien Property Custodian, for the transfer of that property to certain American citizens so as to prevent the taking over of the properties and subsequent sale by the Alien Property Custodian. Suppose that particular property, assuming the statements in the papers are true, should be put up for sale and the purchaser should be the minority American interest, which is American in name only.

It would be the height of folly to permit a sale to take place and that property to come back into the possession of the people who would be operating it simply until the time when they might again give to German citizens and the German Government the influence and control which such ownership carries with it.

Mr. WALSH. Now, just a further question. I agree with the statements of the gentleman, but I thought that an explanation ought to be part of the record. Of course, the second amendment which the gentleman has been discussing does not make it compulsory?

Mr. SHERLEY. It does not.

Mr. WALSH. And certain businesses which are manufacturing things necessary for the war—they can be carried on, I assume, by the Alien Property Custodian if he deems it advisable?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. Under the second amendment?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is true, and of course there is certain property coming into his hands where manifestly there is no reason for the sale. There have come into his hands, for example, stocks in United States companies, in the aggregate representing millions of value. Some German owns certain



shares of stock, we will say, in the Pennsylvania Railroad, or in the United States Steel Co., or in the Illinois Central Railroad, or any other of the great corporations of the country. There is no reason in the world for the selling of that stock. It could be held, and the dividends as they accrue, if they should accrue, turned into the Treasury of the United States, and at the end of the war such disposition of that property could be made as will result from the final adjustment of the claims of the two Governments. But there are many going concerns that are enemy owned, either partially or entirely, many of them representing dominant influences in certain commercial lines. For this country to sit quiet and permit that control to continue; aye, even more than that, to have the Government's own custodian take charge of them, have them expand by virtue of the very war that Germany has forced upon us, and have these people safeguarded in their property, and at the end of the war that they had forced upon this country have that property turned back, greatly enhanced in value and in size, would be so idiotic that it is inconceivable that any people would contemplate it for a moment of time. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. The second amendment also changes the trading-with-the-enemy act in another particular by providing a penalty for the undisclosed principal?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. We undertake to safeguard the matter not only by giving the President the power to provide for sale other than public but we also provide a very severe penalty for any person buying for an undisclosed principal, or for resale to a person not a citizen of the United States, or for the benefit of a person not a citizen of the United States, with a provision also for the forfeiture of the property.

Now, I ought to say, before turning from these important amendments, that in regard to the first amendment there was presented a very interesting situation, one of great hardship to the city of Hoboken. These terminal properties paid annual taxes to the city of Hoboken of about \$140,000. By virtue of their coming into the ownership of the United States they will not be subject to that tax, and the loss at this time of \$140,000 of annual revenue to the city of Hoboken is a very severe loss. It was urged, and strongly urged, by my colleague [Mr. EAGAN], the gentleman from New Jersey, who represents that city, that provision should be made to enable the city to continue to collect taxes from such property; that these properties perhaps differed from usual Government property in that they were properties that could and would be used in a commercial way, and that the municipality ought not to be penalized by virtue of the Government taking them over. I do not think there was a man on the conference but was impressed with the equity that underlaid the argument that was so ably presented by the gentleman, but to have acquiesced in it meant to establish a precedent so far-reaching that we felt that we were not warranted in acquiescing, even if the rules controlling conferees had permitted us, which they did not. If this Government shall ever take over all of the railroads of America it would be presented with the problem in a very acute form as to what provision should be made permitting States and political subdivisions of a State to obtain revenues heretofore obtained from taxation of such property. Manifestly we did not feel that we had the right to undertake to solve that in a conference without any previous expression of a judgment by Congress on the subject.

I mention this because it is only fair to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN], who, in signing this report, has given an exhibition of a Member's ability to look beyond his district and look to the Nation's need rather than simply hold the local viewpoint. [Applause.] The need of the Government in taking this property was great, and he was big enough not to be willing to let a local situation, acute as it was, interfere with him in aiding in the doing of this important national work.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. AUSTIN. On page 64 provision is made for temporary office buildings in the District of Columbia, one item being \$5,775,000, on page 65.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would say to the gentleman that the only change made in the building program was to authorize the department, if it saw fit, to avail itself of heat furnished commercially rather than to create its own heating plant.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was out of the city when the bill passed the House originally. I wanted to ask the gentleman as to these two items, one being \$5,775,000 and the other being \$2,377,500. What profits are paid to the contractors for constructing these

buildings, which I understand were commenced before this bill passed the Senate?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can not answer the gentleman. I understand the frame buildings in Henry Park are to be built by the War Department directly without the interposition of any contractor. I do not know the terms on which the contract has been made touching the building of the concrete buildings at Seventeenth and B Streets.

Mr. AUSTIN. My understanding or information is that the Government is to pay for the cost of labor and material and \$250,000 to the contractor.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is possibly so.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wanted to know whether that embraced all that they were to receive for their work?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say to the gentleman that the answer to that will depend upon the terms of the contract, and that I have no personal knowledge of it. I know in a general way, from talk with Commander Parsons, that he contemplated the building of these buildings through the assistance of a contractor. I have seen, at Seventeenth and B Streets, some temporary frame buildings that are being put up there by a contractor who, I assume, is the contractor who is going to build these buildings.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does not the Committee on Appropriations know anything at all about what the Government is paying for this work?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer the question. I am glad he has made the inquiry. There is probably close to a billion dollars worth of contract work under way or to be taken up shortly. The Committee on Appropriations could not, if it worked 24 hours a day all the time and did nothing else, follow and undertake to pass judgment upon the wisdom or lack of wisdom with which various contracts are let or the terms of such contracts. Now, I say that because the gentleman has touched on a question infinitely bigger than the reason for his inquiry and infinitely bigger than the question as to these buildings.

I believe that the time has come, and I have so stated to responsible heads in the War Department and elsewhere, when the War Department ought to be in a position to perform a lot of work directly without the interposition of contractors. As to whether that is wise or not, men will differ, and men do differ, but it seems to me that that was true as to that character of building which was simple and ordinary and concerning which the department has now had considerable experience. When the war broke they did not have the organization to enable them to do such work, but they ought now to have the organization that would enable them in many instances to do it, and they ought not to pay out money to contractors where contractors are not needed. There is work of some kind where the use of contractors will probably be both necessary and desirable, in the interest of both speed and economy.

Touching these particular concrete buildings, I am not prepared to say that it is not the part of wisdom, having in mind the desire to get them speedily and to get them cheaply, to pay an organization that has had experience in the building of similar work a fee for supervising such work. Now, the price fixed, in my judgment, prevents any great waste of money. We provided for buildings of a size that would make a total cost of \$3 a square foot. Before arriving at that opinion we had the judgment of the Army, of the Navy, of the Superintendent of the Capitol, and of Treasury officials as to cost; and their figures, as I stated, and as the gentleman would have heard me state if he had been here when the bill was up, ran from \$2.50 to \$3.09 a square foot, dependent somewhat on the character of the foundations that might have to be made. I understand that the gentleman has learned—because it came to me through another gentleman—that there was some contractor who claimed that he could build concrete buildings for \$1.50 a square foot. If he can, I bid him Godspeed, because he will be doing something that nobody else has ever done for this kind of building, as far as I have been able to learn. I am not a builder and I have to take the advice of the men who ought to know. Now, I would be glad if some of the legislative committees would undertake to function instead of criticize and would provide a rule as to how money should be expended in connection with the building program of the Government. The Committee on Appropriations will welcome such legislation. But I suggest to those who draw it that they will find something of a problem in making a rule which will bind and which will not also prevent.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I say a word or two?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman may ask me a question in my time.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have not criticized the committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. I did not say the gentleman had.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has reported a bill here which I think goes further than this bill or any other bill in protecting the interests of the Government in requiring that this work shall be given out on a competitive basis. There is no safeguard in any of these bills so far.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; there is. There is a price fixed.

Mr. AUSTIN. In this bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And in the public-building bill, too.

Mr. AUSTIN. As to the contractor who offered to do the work for \$1.50. I had no talk with him.

Mr. SHERLEY. I know the gentleman had not.

Mr. AUSTIN. But a Member of this House did, and he said this man came to him with the strongest indorsements as to reliability and efficiency, and that he offered to do it for \$1.50, and that we were paying \$3.

Mr. SHERLEY. If he can do it, I hope he will get an opportunity to do it. I will say to the gentleman, further, that it is absolutely impossible for either the committee or for Congress by legislation so to safeguard the expenditures of these huge sums as to prevent extravagance at times, desirable as it is to prevent it. I can not do it. In all the matters that the committee has had to deal with it has tried to get all the information it can. When it brings the bills to this floor it gives all the information it has. After the bills have become laws, the responsibility must rest with the administrative officers, and in these particular cases I do not think there is any liability of any great amount of extravagance, because the price was fixed after an investigation which showed what the price would probably be.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the gentleman know whether in this instance that I am giving him, of the Government building where the contractor was given a contract which gave him \$250,000 profit for three or four months' work, any other reliable contractor in the United States was asked whether he would do it for less money?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know; but I have no doubt that the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department, having had considerable experience as to cost, and having control over the cost as they will have control over this, and desiring to build the building within the time necessary and within the limit of cost necessary, chose people who they thought were responsible and capable. I had nothing to do, as I will never have anything to do, with the suggestion of any human being for any contractual relationship with the Government. The responsibility is with the Navy Department. If the gentleman has a quarrel with what has been done, his quarrel rests with the Navy Department.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am asking this for information—

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no doubt that they will be able to give good and substantial reasons for any action that they have taken.

Mr. AUSTIN. The reason I asked the gentleman whether the contractors were to have more than \$250,000 profit was that it was stated that if they succeeded in constructing the buildings for less than a certain fixed amount they were to have an additional fee for their services, and I wanted some information, and naturally thought the committee dealing with this matter and reporting the appropriation could give us some. If the gentleman does not know of any means or method by which we can protect the interests of the Government against these exorbitant prices for this work, very good.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mixes up assumptions with statements of facts that make his conclusions totally illogical. He says exorbitant fees. The gentleman assumes that a fee of \$250,000 for the construction of buildings of this character within a certain time that will cost about \$5,000,000 is an extravagant fee. I deny on the face of it that it is an extravagant fee. If it is an unnecessary fee, it ought not to be paid, but the assumption that the gentleman makes I submit has not yet been supported by anything more than his statement.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the Committee on Appropriations would say to these departments that are getting this money "you must submit the proposition to more than one reliable contractor and have competitive bids," it would be done.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say to the gentleman that I have not only gone to the heads of the departments but I have gone further and oftener than the gentleman or any gentleman he can name to various officials of this Government to safeguard public expenditures whenever I learned of anything that warranted me in doing so. I can not take idle rumor and make it the basis of representations, and no other man with any appreciation of responsibility of office and of the tremendous tasks that

we are dealing with now could do so; but if the gentleman at any time will bring to me any detailed statement of facts I will guarantee to see to it that it comes to the immediate attention of the responsible officials of the Government.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not challenge or question the gentleman's sincerity or his splendid work in reducing expenditures, for we all know—

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, let us dispense with the compliments.

Mr. AUSTIN. That he favors economy and reduction of public expenditures; but I do not think I am giving offense by in this public manner—

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman could not be offensive.

Mr. AUSTIN. Suggesting to this committee that has the handling of the money of the taxpayers that we might reduce the enormous expenses growing out of the construction of these buildings by having competitive bids or propositions from contractors; and there are many of them all over this country who have been here to Washington appealing to the Members of this House to give them an opportunity to bid on some of these propositions, and they have gone home without having that opportunity.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is quite true; and much of the criticism has been from men who did not get contracts because other people did. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

Mr. BURNETT. Did they have any opportunity?

Mr. SHERLEY. They ought to have a chance, of course, if they are responsible people. How much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. Forty-nine minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 30 minutes additional time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that he may have 30 minutes additional time. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Can no other Member of the House get an opportunity for a few minutes to express his views on this bill without the consent of the gentleman in charge?

Mr. SHERLEY. He can not do it in my hour.

The SPEAKER. He can not as long as the gentleman's hour lasts, and if it is extended to an hour and a half the same conditions apply.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. After that will there be then opportunity?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman does not move the previous question, the matter can be debated indefinitely.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman consent that I have a very few minutes at the conclusion of his time?

Mr. SHERLEY. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. GILLET. Does not the gentleman intend to yield any time?

Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably I do. I did not want to take half the time that I have consumed, but I have tried to yield to questions of any gentleman on the floor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that his time be extended for 30 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to have about 15 minutes—or 10 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall yield the gentleman 10 minutes in a few moments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to make an inquiry in connection with Senate amendment No. 44, which is substantive legislation.

Mr. SHERLEY. I was coming to that just when I asked for the time. Amendment 44 is an amendment authorizing the payment of claims for property lost by officers, enlisted men, and female nurses of the Army. As originally proposed by the Senate it was very much broader than as it was agreed to in conference. The House conferees insisted upon the amendment going out, believing it could more properly await action of the Military Committees of the House and Senate. The Senate conferees insisted and persisted upon its remaining in the bill. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs had reported such a bill and it had been put on in the Senate in accordance with their rules. A similar bill was pending before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and the conferees finally agreed to the provision with a limitation that narrowed it, and instead of the provision as it left the Senate providing for the repayment either in money or in kind of all the property that officers or



enlisted men or nurses were required to have and which might be lost under circumstances enumerated it now provides for the reimbursement in money or in property of only such property as they are required to have in the field service, restricting it in that regard. It also eliminated one of the cases, which was that the property should be reimbursed whenever the loss was without fault or negligence on the part of the owner. We provided it should be reimbursed whenever it was without fault or negligence on the part of the owner in the three cases set forth in the report.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was it the purpose of the conferees to limit this reimbursement for property lost by the enlisted force in the Army to the war alone?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; and it is limited to the war.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, the only limitation I find of that character is next to the last paragraph, which, after the prior language, would lead me to believe it was to continue for all time.

Mr. SHERLEY. It was not so intended. What happened was the Senate undertook to amend the present law which relates to the payment of claims in peace times by making it apply both to peace and war times and making it very much wider. We did not change that statute at all, but we limited this to the cases enumerated, and in the limitation of the time when claims can be presented it is provided that claims must be made within one year after the claim arises, or made within six months after peace. That necessarily limits it to the war, and then we also limit it to property which they are required to have in field service.

Mr. STAFFORD. So virtually that limitation is in effect during the existence of the pending war, that this authority shall be granted for the payment of these claims?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is my understanding. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DALLINGER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky why the appropriation of \$100,000 for the Watertown arsenal was stricken out of the bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. It was stricken out because it related to some offices at Watertown that we felt we could get fuller information about and come to a better judgment on in connection with the estimates of the sundry civil bill, and that is a bill that will necessarily come on the statute books within two or three months, and it was not such an emergency as to warrant us in carrying it at this time.

Mr. DALLINGER. It does not mean—

Mr. SHERLEY. It does not mean we either approve or disapprove of the item.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. With reference to the other item, amendment No. 44 to the Senate bill, why was not that made to apply to commissioned officers and men in the Navy as well as in the Army?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, they have a law of their own, and then the Senate put this on, and we could not have added a provision as to the Navy as a germane amendment.

Mr. ROWE. There seems to me a good deal more complaint in my section of the country in reference to losses by men in the Navy.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is a matter that should address itself to the Committee on Naval Affairs. We have no jurisdiction of it.

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the urgent deficiency bill, as it passed the House, as explained by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], was amended in one very important respect. The first amendment authorized the President to acquire the title to the docks, piers, warehouses, wharves, and terminal equipment and facilities now owned by the North German Lloyd Dock Co. and the Hamburg-American Line Terminal & Navigation Co., in Hoboken, if he shall deem it necessary for the national security and defense, provided that if such property can not be procured by purchase the President is authorized to take over for the United States the immediate possession and title thereof. Upon the taking over of the property by the President, the title to the property shall immediately vest in the United States.

I feel that I should call the attention of the House more explicitly to the effect that that will have on the city of Hoboken. The gentleman from Kentucky said it would mean a loss of \$140,000 in taxes. It will be nearer to \$150,000, and coming at this time it will work very great hardship on the city, due to the fact that by the operation of the half-mile prohibitory zone the city of Hoboken will lose next year in excise taxes about \$125,000 additional. Four-fifths of the saloons of the city are within the prohibited area and a good many of them have

already been closed, and the city expects to lose practically all of that revenue next year.

In addition to that, Hoboken will lose a very substantial amount—the exact amount can not be figured now—in the taxable value of the properties in which those saloons are located, so that all in all Hoboken will be placed in a most embarrassing position.

I did my utmost in the conference committee to provide some remedy for Hoboken, but without success. I do not know whether any remedy can yet be found, but I submit that it will be a very great injustice to Hoboken if some way can not be found whereby the city may continue to receive the taxes on these docks. Were it not for the fact that many of the items carried in this urgent deficiency bill bear directly on the prosecution of the war, I should have refused to agree to the conference report.

This amendment was put on as a rider to the urgent deficiency bill in the Senate. No opportunity was afforded to the officials or citizens of Hoboken to be heard, and under the rules that govern conference committees no legislation could be effected in the conference.

The amount of money represented in the taxes paid by these steamship companies is about one-eighth of the total taxable revenues of the city from real estate taxes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is the property said to be worth?

Mr. EAGAN. The German steamship piers, buildings, and lands were assessed for taxation purposes in 1917 to the extent of about \$6,283,000, if I remember correctly. Our total ratables are about \$79,000,000. This property along the river front comprises about one-third of our entire water-front, and is probably the most valuable property in the city.

Hoboken is a thoroughly loyal city. It has done its full duty in the liberty-bond drives and in every war appeal that has been made to the American people, including the call to the colors. It feels particularly honored by being made the port of embarkation of our fighting forces in the great war in which we are now engaged. It is the last bit of American soil which the boys in khaki tread upon before embarking for France. It welcomed the taking over of these docks by Uncle Sam.

I submit that if this is to be not only a war measure but must be extended over into peace times as well, and the property owned for all time by the United States, some remedial legislation, some way must be found to provide the money that we are going to lose in taxes. Hoboken can not stand this loss. It will be a blow from which it may not be able to recover. Hoboken can not materially reduce its expenses. It is the most thickly settled city in America, probably in the world, and this imposes, of itself, a serious tax burden, especially for school purposes.

Hoboken has no means of substantially increasing its taxes, and its tax rate will be increased upward of 50 points by the loss of this revenue and by the loss in excise revenue that I referred to a moment ago.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the gentleman mean by "50 points"?

Mr. EAGAN. The rate is now \$23.20 per thousand, and the loss of this revenue and the excise revenues will mean that the remaining property of the city, exclusive of the steamship docks, will have to bear all of the tax burden.

Mr. MADDEN. About 1 per cent additional?

Mr. EAGAN. No; it is very much more than that. The German steamship docks and buildings paid nearly \$150,000 in taxes last year. The estimated loss in excise revenues will be about \$125,000, or \$275,000 in all. The total of the taxes of the city last year was about \$1,400,000. The loss in revenue from both of these sources amounts to about 20 per cent, and this loss will have to be borne by the remainder of the property in the city subject to taxation. As I have said before, Hoboken can not stand this great loss of revenue, and it must be given relief in some way, so far as the German docks are concerned. If this 20 per cent is added to the remaining property subject to taxation, it would make the tax rate about \$27.86 a thousand.

Mr. MADDEN. \$23 per capita?

Mr. EAGAN. \$23.20 per \$1,000 is now the tax rate.

Mr. MADDEN. That is \$2.32 per hundred?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. "Fifty points" would mean that you would go up to almost \$2.80 a hundred, instead of \$2.32?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes; on the remaining property.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. Has Hoboken any municipal docks?

Mr. EAGAN. No. Unfortunately we have not a foot of water-front property that belongs to the municipality.

Mr. NORTON. Could the city take over these docks and operate them?

Mr. EAGAN. The city would be very glad of the opportunity to take over the docks and lease them to the Federal Government at an agreed price that would represent its interest on the bonds and the amount that the city now receives in taxes. There is no objection whatever to the Federal Government taking over the property, but the city is not in a position to stand this drain. I submit it should not be put to such a great hardship and injury as this will entail.

Mr. NORTON. It occurred to me that the municipality might be able to operate the docks more efficiently than the Government at this time.

Mr. EAGAN. The municipality would be glad to do that, but it yields, of course, to the Federal Government.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. I suppose it is true that this property is always increasing in value. Would it not therefore be an increasing loss each year, because the rate would be the same and the property value greater?

Mr. EAGAN. That is so. During the last 10 years the assessed value of the property has increased about 100 per cent. Perhaps the property was undervalued for taxation purposes in the past, but the increase in the assessed valuation is due, in the main, I think, to the great increase in the value of this property. It is invaluable.

Now, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to extend my remarks by the insertion of a telegram from Hon. P. R. Griffin, mayor of Hoboken, an editorial from the Hudson Observer, of Hoboken, and an editorial from the Hudson Dispatch, of Union Hill, N. J.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HOBOKEN, N. J., March 16, 1918.

Hon. JOHN J. EAGAN,

Member of House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The city of Hoboken is very much opposed to the Government taking title to the German steamship piers, unless adequate provision is made for the protection of the city on the taxes. If the Government takes title, and thereby the taxes of the piers are lost, it will practically mean bankruptcy to the city. I would request that you arrange for a hearing and give Hoboken an opportunity to be heard. Wire me particulars if you please.

P. R. GRIFFIN,  
Mayor of Hoboken.

[From Hudson Observer, of Hoboken, N. J., Mar. 22, 1918.]

A MOST SERIOUS PROBLEM NOW CONFRONTS THE TAXPAYERS OF HOBOKEN—TIME TO ACT.

What will the Government do to recompense Hoboken for the loss of taxes involved in the taking over of the piers and their permanent retention? The loss of \$150,000 a year in taxes on top of the shrinkage from liquor licenses certain to follow the continuation of the barred zone is a blow from which the whole city will stagger unless speedy methods of relief are found. Wiping out at one swoop 20 per cent of its ratables is just about the most serious blow any community can sustain.

In Hoboken's case the destruction is worse than that caused by a great fire, for in such a case the ground value remains and buildings may be replaced. But local taxation of Government-owned property is impossible, either directly or indirectly, and hence, so far as Hoboken's finances are concerned, the docks and piers are irretrievably wiped out.

The situation is unprecedented. No other city in the country ever has or probably ever will be called on to face its like. But it is distinctly a war emergency. The burden is cast upon Hoboken for the benefit of the entire country. Therefore, at least until Hoboken can be afforded ample opportunity to readjust itself to the changed conditions the problem is in effect a national problem and should be dealt with as such by the National Government which has created it. We do not know what form of assistance can be extended under the circumstances, but it must be given, and given quickly, in one way or another. The situation deserves and will doubtless have the prompt attention of the President. The entire New Jersey delegation in Congress should be prepared to act if remedial legislation is deemed advisable. It stands to reason that the United States Government will see that the situation is cleared up satisfactorily to the city. Mayor Griffin and the city commissioners should not delay action in the matter.

[From the Hudson Dispatch, of Union Hill, N. J., Mar. 23, 1918.]

THE TAXES ON HOBOKEN PIERS.

It would be outrageously unfair for the Government to take title to the valuable German piers in Hoboken, without making provision for the payment of taxes in full upon the property. Hoboken can not afford to lose \$150,000 taxes, and the Government has no right to expect the taxpayers of the city to make up such a deficit.

The exemption of the piers from taxation would be vastly different from the exemption of post offices. Every city and every municipality has a post office, which is exempt from taxation, so that it is about "even up" on that score.

But when it comes to steamship piers Hoboken would be carrying a burden which no other municipality in the land would carry for the Government. A city like Hoboken has to depend upon its valuable water-front property for a big share of its taxes, and any plan for the Government ownership of the piers should be predicated upon the payment of taxes upon them.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the first of these amendments proposes new legislation; the second does not propose new legislation, but only to amend an existing law enacted last October and known as the trading-with-the-enemy act. I voted for the trading-with-the-enemy act, as did also, I believe, every other Member of the House who was present when the vote was taken, and I am prepared to vote for anything proper which will make it more effective. And therefore it is of course clear that I question the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. SHERLEY] about the legal purport of these two amendments during his opening speech, not because I was opposed to the trading-with-the-enemy act, or to its amendment, but because of the exceeding importance of his statement that the two amendments, if enacted into law, would permit the custodian of alien property, in his discretion, to sell certain wharves and docks in Hoboken belonging to two New Jersey corporations which are specifically named in the first amendment. Now, that, I think, is not a proper construction of the two amendments taken together. On the contrary, in my judgment, if these two amendments become law, the power to acquire the title to the property named in the first amendment will be vested exclusively in the President of the United States.

Before further discussing this point I desire briefly to remind gentlemen of the importance of water terminals, and to say that it is my strong belief that on grounds of high public policy the United States should not sell any of its wharf or dock property located on navigable waters. This, I believe, because of the constant embarrassing troubles which communities undergo through the private monopolization of water terminal facilities. I maintain that whenever the United States Government becomes the owner in fee of wharfage, dockage, or similar facilities on navigable streams or harbors, it never should absolutely relinquish that title.

This question is not a new one in Congress. Some years ago a bill was introduced in the House which proposed to give the Government the right to sell virtually at private sale wharves and docks which it owned in the harbor of San Juan in Porto Rico. That bill was opposed and defeated on the floor. A few years earlier an attempt was made to sell wharfage and docks which the Government owned in Alaska. That provision was in a bill favorably reported here, but when brought to the attention of the House it was defeated. Now, I think, at least I hope, that the President will construe this amended bill so that the first Senate amendment will mean that he, the President, shall have the exclusive authority to acquire the title to and to control the Hoboken wharfage and other property here in question. This, I hope, in part also, because of the predicament in which Hoboken may soon find herself. If necessary, the President might be empowered, in behalf of the National Government, to lease the docks and other property to that municipality for a time, or perhaps until after this war is over and normal conditions shall be restored, or perhaps with the privilege—though this I do not urge—of buying the property at a certain figure, on an amortization plan, so much each year for interest and so much for payment of an installment on the principal, and with a provision that if Hoboken ever should attempt to sell the property the title should thereupon immediately revert to the Government of the United States.

But the only really sound policy is for the Government not to sell any of its water terminals. That is a forward-looking view to take of a problem now being presented to the business interests of this country everywhere, but with especial force wherever there is a monopolization of such terminal facilities, and the consequent power to dictate to manufacturers and other shippers. It is, and for years has been, one of the most important business problems before the American people—this question of the control of transportation terminal facilities.

I now ask the attention of gentlemen to the language of this first amendment:

The President is authorized to acquire the title to the docks, piers, warehouses, wharves, and terminal equipment and facilities on the Hudson River now owned by the North German Lloyd Dock Co. and the Hamburg-American Line Terminal & Navigation Co., two corporations of the State of New Jersey, if he shall deem it necessary for the national security and defense: *Provided*, That if such property can not be procured by purchase, then the President is authorized and empowered to take over for the United States the immediate possession and title thereof.



The President will not have to wait for a jury. He himself can take and pay for the property, and thereupon the title instantly will vest in the United States. He can alone fix the amount to be paid as compensation.

If any such property shall be taken over as aforesaid, the United States shall make just compensation therefor, to be determined by the President. Upon the taking over of said property by the President, as aforesaid, the title to all such property so taken over shall immediately vest in the United States.

This first amendment, when enacted, will be new legislation. And this new legislation will relate exclusively to certain property—docks, wharves, and so forth—therein specifically described. Now, this property, so specifically described, is property which was previously included in the provisions of the trading-with-the-enemy act approved in October last, but only in general terms. In that act of last October there is no specific mention of these particular wharves and other property. On the contrary, as I have said, the provisions of that act apply to all alien enemy property and are general in character. And, therefore, in so far as that act of last October may be held to include in its general terms this property in Hoboken, it is now, as to that property, to be entirely repealed by this first amendment, which makes new and complete provisions concerning that property, and in express, specific terms. Under the trading-with-the-enemy act power over all the property of all alien enemies is given in general language to the Custodian of Alien Property, but under this first amendment power over certain particular pieces of such property belonging to certain of these alien enemies is in specific language given to the President, and to him alone.

In other words, the first amendment, in clear, specific terms, takes the particular property in Hoboken out from under the general language of the trading-with-the-enemy act, and therefore repeals that act in so far as it relates to that particular property.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. Certainly it ought not to be considered the intention of Congress to give the Custodian of Alien Property the right to sell this property in the city of Hoboken to any corporation, any steamboat company which already may have abundant wharfage facilities, and may desire to acquire this Hoboken property to help enable it to secure a monopoly of terminal facilities.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. If the property is owned in part by loyal American owners, what would the gentleman say as to the constitutionality of these proceedings?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I understand it is owned by two New Jersey corporations, the stockholders of which are Germans and alien enemies. Nevertheless, the corporations are both New Jersey corporations, and the dealings would be had with New Jersey corporations, artificial beings, acting through their officers.

And the title to be taken over would be the title of the corporation, not the title of the individual stockholders.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would not wish the custodian of alien property to have power to sell this property to some steamship company which already in the city of New York has abundant dock facilities. And yet he will have that power if the construction is that the first amendment does not confer upon the President exclusive jurisdiction respecting the property in Hoboken. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DEWALT. The trading-with-the-enemy act provides that the Alien Custodian can take stock of any alien enemy in any corporation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is a New Jersey corporation an alien enemy?

Mr. DEWALT. No, no; but if the stock of the corporation, and whether it be a New Jersey or a Pennsylvania corporation makes no difference, is owned by an alien enemy, and an alien enemy is one who resides in alien territory, then that stock can be taken by the Alien Custodian. So here the remedy would be for the Alien Property Custodian to take the stock, and he would have the voting power of the stock naturally as he had the stock; but that would not necessarily give him title to the real estate. He would only have the stock.

Mr. SHERLEY. And if the gentleman would permit, he has had the stock for months.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But the first amendment authorizes and empowers the President of the United States to

take over the specifically described Hoboken property of two corporations.

This means all of the property of the corporations—stock and everything else. He can take it, regardless of the wishes of the custodian of alien property. The first amendment expressly authorizes the President to do this. It does not leave it to inference.

Mr. GRAY of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. GRAY of New Jersey. Does not the gentleman remember that the United States Government has taken over all of the rest of the property of these corporations without the consideration that the gentleman had in mind, namely, the ships belonging to them, for which these terminal facilities were secured?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But the gentleman mistakes the point under discussion. The law of last October gave, in general terms, the custodian the right to take over all of the property of all alien enemies. Here is a new section to be enacted now—in March, 1918—taking out in express terms from the general provisions of the trading-with-the-enemy act of last October certain specific property, which it names, and giving complete authority over it to the President. Therefore that property thus named is taken out of the jurisdiction of the custodian of alien property.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. STEELE. This is a new, specific authority to condemn, regardless of the trading-with-the-enemy act of last October.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Repeals by implication are not favored in the law. That is the ordinary rule of statutory construction. But it is true also that in this instance we have what is equivalent to a repeal in express terms, because, as I said a moment ago, the act of October, 1917, in general terms, gives authority over all the property of all alien enemies to the Custodian of Alien Property, while the pending first amendment gives authority over certain portions of this property belonging to certain specifically named alien enemies to the President.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I sincerely hope that the President will thus construe the law and take immediate possession of those wharves and other property up there. That, in my judgment, would be the true way to solve this problem. The two amendments ought not to be so construed as to permit the Custodian of Alien Property to sell it at public or private sale to some corporation which now already has great wharfage facilities in New York and that will pay three times the value of the property in order to own and control it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman object to the Congress providing for the acquisition of this specific property through legislation such as this, rather than leaving it to the Alien Property Custodian?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. No. The gentleman misunderstands me.

Mr. WALSH. That is all this amendment does.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. WALSH. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall detain the House only a few moments longer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has only one minute remaining.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman from Illinois will yield me additional time?

Mr. CANNON. I yield the gentleman such time as he desires.

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall not want more than 10 minutes. I shall not detain the House unnecessarily, and would not at all if it had not been for the statements made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER]. I am just as anxious as he is, and I am sure the President of the United States is as anxious as he is, that this property shall neither go back into the hands of former German owners, nor go into the hands of any private monopolistic control. The very purpose of this provision, put in at the suggestion of the President himself, was in order that the United States Government might acquire with the idea of keeping, these terminals at Hoboken and not with the idea of having the Alien Property Custodian sell them to anybody else.

Now, the sole effect of the first amendment is to give plainly the right, first to the President to negotiate and purchase, and failing, if it be conceivable that he could fail, dealing with the Alien Property Custodian—failing negotiations for the purchase, the right to take. That is the plain meaning of it, and he who runs may read. Now, there is no better way I know of to assure the thing that the gentleman has in mind than what we have provided.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not now. Now, the second amendment was an amendment introduced not simply because of the Hoboken docks, but introduced for all alien property in order to correct an omission in the original alien property act, to give to the Alien Property Custodian the right to sell for any cause and not simply the right to sell to prevent waste, which is the way the law now reads which is upon the statute book. Now, what will happen will be this: The President will negotiate with the Alien Property Custodian for the purchase of these properties. Failing to arrive at an agreement he will take the property under the power that is given, and if he does take the properties by the very terms of the act authorizing him to take them he must make just compensation and the title vests in the United States, and having vested in the United States I hope it will not be given or sold to the city of Hoboken or to anybody. I hope it will always remain the property of the United States, and that is the intention of the provision, and there is no amount of construction that can change the plain meaning of this particular section.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Just a question.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The reason I took the floor a moment ago was that I understood the gentleman to say, in reply to my question earlier to-day, that the second amendment—the one which amends the "trading-with-the-enemy act," approved in October last—authorized the Custodian of Alien Property to sell these docks.

Mr. SHERLEY. Authorized him to sell all property that is in his possession as alien-property custodian.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The docks are in his custody, then can he sell the docks?

Mr. SHERLEY. He can and will to the United States.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think I understood the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin. He was trying to provide against the danger, as I understood it, of the Alien Property Custodian selling these docks to some other corporation, but suppose the United States Government buys them, the title comes to the United States and thereupon he loses the right to sell to anybody else.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course he does.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That takes them out of his custody.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is inconceivable that the alien-property custodian under the control of the President, appointed and removable by him at will, would sell or undertake to sell the property to some one other than the United States when the Congress has gone to the extent, at the instance of the President, of expressly providing that the President may buy them for the United States.

Mr. MADDEN. He could commandeer them if he wished.

Mr. SHERLEY. Not only has he the right to commandeer their use but this property is being controlled by the Government now and used in connection with its war purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. So when the disposition is made of these properties at Hoboken to the United States Government the custodian is out of the control of them entirely?

Mr. SHERLEY. Why, yes; what he will get is a certain amount of money as the purchase price for them, which he will turn over to the United States Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. For a subsequent accounting?

Mr. SHERLEY. And have to account for it at the end of the war.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is exactly the construction which I hoped the gentleman will say is the correct one.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have never said anything else from the beginning. The gentleman misunderstood me, and what led the gentleman into error, if he will permit me, was this thought, that he keeps thinking of the second amendment as having been written simply in its relationship to the Hoboken property.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Oh, no.

Mr. SHERLEY. Whereas the second amendment was written for the purpose of affecting all property in the hands of the custodian.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The first amendment is new legislation and relates exclusively and specifically in its terms

to wharves and docks in Hoboken owned by two New Jersey corporations. I was not mistaken as to the facts. I simply misunderstood the gentleman from Kentucky this morning if he then said what he now says is the proper construction of these two amendments.

Mr. SHERLEY. There is no doubt. I know the matter originated with the President. I know his wishes; I know what we are intending to do here, and anybody who reads the section can have but one conclusion. The first section provides the United States may buy; the second section provides that the Alien Property Custodian may sell this or any other property that he has in his possession. The result will be that the title to this property will be turned over to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report, and upon that I move the previous question.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman admitted by his last statement that the statute is not mandatory and that the custodian can sell or may sell to the highest bidder those wharves and docks, but he hopes that the custodian will sell them to the President.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not hope. I know he will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Exactly; but I claim that under the best and proper construction it ought to be held that the first amendment confers exclusive power upon the President to acquire these docks and wharves, and that as to them there is no discretion left in the custodian.

Mr. SHERLEY. We do not need to waste any time. What the gentleman believes ought to be compelled I know will be done, and we might as well move on.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

#### PAYMENT OF INCOME TAX BY INSTALLMENTS.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman if it does not take over five minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. I send to the desk a letter, which I do not think will take over two minutes to read, from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue relative to the possibility of having the income tax paid by installments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, March 22, 1918.

Hon. HENRY A. BARNHART,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BARNHART: I have your favor of the 16th instant inclosing a letter from Mr. M. W. Mix, president Dodge Manufacturing Co., Mishawaka, Ind., in which he suggests that some plan be adopted for the payment in installments, throughout the year, of income and excess profits taxes due on June 15 next.

There is no provision of law under which this department may defer, beyond June 15, 1918, the payment of income and excess profits taxes, and the financial requirements of the Government are such as to make it unwise for this department to recommend to Congress at this time the enactment of legislation that will authorize the department to defer such payments beyond June 15.

The situation to which you have directed attention has been given most serious consideration. Such action has been taken to minimize the strain of sudden withdrawals as is permissible under existing laws; as, for example, Treasury Decision 2622 authorizes the partial payment, in advance, of income and excess profits taxes established to be due for the taxable year 1917, and Treasury Decision 2639 authorizes and directs the acceptance of Treasury certificates of indebtedness, at par and accrued interest, in payment of income and excess profits taxes due on June 15 next. About \$1,250,000,000 of certificates maturing in June and acceptable in payment of income and excess profits taxes have been issued and sold. This is about one-half of the estimated amount of those taxes.

I am strongly in favor of having the taxes paid in installments, but I think they ought to be paid in installments in advance, and that payment of taxes ought not to be deferred.

These devices will serve effectually, it is believed, to reduce the strain on financial institutions, and further relief may be afforded by taxpayers who will anticipate the necessity of paying their taxes and arrange their financial affairs accordingly.

Let me add that the passage of the war finance corporation bill will, I think, have considerable effect along certain lines in relieving any undue strain in connection with the payment of income and excess profits taxes.

Respectfully,

DANIEL C. ROPER,  
Commissioner.

#### INCREASED PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the postal salary bill, H. R. 9414.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House



on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9414.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees. Those in favor of going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union will, as their names are called, answer "yea" and those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 356, nays 1, not voting 74, as follows:

YEAS—356.			
Alexander	Emerson	Kraus	Rouse
Almon	Esch	La Follette	Rowe
Anderson	Evans	Langley	Rubey
Anthony	Fairchild, B. L.	Larsen	Rucker
Ashbrook	Fairfield	Lazaro	Russell
Aswell	Farr	Lee, Ga.	Sabath
Austin	Ferris	Leibach	Sanders, Ind.
Ayres	Fields	Leshner	Sanders, La.
Bacharach	Fisher	Lever	Sanders, N. Y.
Baer	Flynn	Linthicum	Sanford
Bankhead	Focht	Little	Saunders, Va.
Barnhart	Foss	Lobeck	Scott, Iowa
Beakes	Foster	London	Scott, Mich.
Bell	Francis	Loneragan	Scully
Beshlin	Frear	Longworth	Sears
Black	Freeman	Lufkin	Sells
Bland	French	Lundeen	Shackleford
Blanton	Fuller, Ill.	Lunn	Shallenberger
Boober	Fuller, Mass.	McAndrews	Sherwood
Bowers	Gallagher	McArthur	Shouse
Britten	Gallivan	McClintic	Siegel
Browne	Garland	McCormick	Sims
Browning	Garner	McCulloch	Sinnett
Buchanan	Garrett, Tenn.	McFadden	Slayden
Burnett	Garrett, Tex.	McKenzie	Slemp
Burroughs	Gillett	McKeown	Sloan
Butler	Glynn	McKinley	Small
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snell
Campbell, Kans.	Gordon	McLemore	Snook
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Madden	Snyder
Candler, Miss.	Gray, Ala.	Mabee	Stafford
Cannon	Gray, N. J.	Maher	Stegall
Cantrill	Green, Iowa	Mansfield	Stedman
Caraway	Greene, Mass.	Mapes	Steele
Carew	Greene, Vt.	Martin	Steenerson
Carter, Mass.	Gregg	Mason	Stephens, Miss.
Carter, Okla.	Griest	Mays	Stephens, Nebr.
Cary	Griffin	Merritt	Sterling, Ill.
Chandler, Okla.	Hadley	Mondell	Sterling, Pa.
Church	Hamilton, Mich.	Montague	Stevenson
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Moon	Stiness
Clark, Pa.	Hamlin	Moore, Pa.	Strong
Claypool	Hardy	Moore, Ind.	Sullivan
Cleary	Harrison, Va.	Morgan	Summers
Coady	Haskell	Morin	Sweet
Collier	Hastings	Mudd	Swift
Connally, Tex.	Haugen	Neely	Switzer
Connelly, Kans.	Hawley	Nelson	Tague
Cooper, W. Va.	Hayden	Nicholls, S. C.	Talbot
Cooper, Wis.	Heaton	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Ark.
Costello	Hedlin	Nolan	Taylor, Colo.
Cox	Helm	Norton	Temple
Crago	Helvering	Oldfield	Thompson
Cramton	Hensley	Oliver, Ala.	Tillman
Crisp	Hersey	Oliver, N. Y.	Tilson
Crosser	Hicks	Olney	Timberlake
Currie, Mich.	Hilliard	Osborne	Tinkham
Dale, N. Y.	Holland	O'Shaunessy	Townner
Dale, Vt.	Hood	Overstreet	Treadway
Dallinger	Houston	Padgett	Venable
Darrow	Howard	Palge	Vestal
Davis	Huddleston	Park	Vinson
Decker	Hull, Iowa	Parker, N. J.	Voigt
Delaney	Hull, Tenn.	Parker, N. Y.	Waldow
Dempsey	Humphreys	Peters	Walker
Denison	Husted	Phelan	Walton
Denton	Hutchinson	Platt	Wason
Dewalt	Igoe	Polk	Watkins
Dickinson	Ireland	Porter	Watson, Pa.
Dill	Jacaway	Pou	Watson, Va.
Dillon	James	Purnell	Weaver
Dixon	Johnson, Wash.	Quin	Welling
Dominick	Jones, Tex.	Rainey	Whaley
Donovan	Jones, Va.	Raker	Wheeler
Doolling	Juni	Ramsey	White, Me.
Doollittle	Keating	Ramseyer	White, Ohio
Doremus	Kelley, Mich.	Randall	Williams
Doughton	Kelly, Pa.	Rankin	Wilson, Ill.
Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Rayburn	Wilson, La.
Drane	Kennedy, R. I.	Reavis	Wilson, Tex.
Dunn	Kettner	Reed	Wingo
Dyer	Key, Ohio	Riordan	Winslow
Eagan	Kiess, Pa.	Robbins	Woods, Iowa
Eagle	Kincheloe	Robinson	Woodyard
Edmonds	King	Rodenberg	Wright
Elliot	Kinkaid	Rogers	Young, N. Dak.
Ellsworth	Kitchin	Romjue	Young, Tex.
Elston	Knutson	Rose	Zihlman

NAYS—1.

Walsh

#### NOT VOTING—74.

Barkley	Fairchild, G. W.	Kearns	Schall
Blackmon	Fess	Kehoe	Scott, Pa.
Borland	Flood	Kreider	Sherley
Brand	Fordney	LaGuardia	Sisson
Brodbeck	Gandy	Lea, Cal.	Smith, Idaho
Brumbaugh	Gard	Lenroot	Smith, C. B.
Caldwell	Glass	Littlepage	Smith, T. E.
Carlin	Good	Mann	Templeton
Chandler, N. Y.	Goodall	Meeker	Thomas
Classon	Gould	Miller, Minn.	Van Dyke
Copple, Ohio	Graham, Pa.	Miller, Wash.	Vare
Copple, Cal.	Harrison, Miss.	Mott	Volstead
Davidson	Hayes	Overmyer	Ward
Dent	Heintz	Powers	Webb
Dies	Hollingsworth	Pratt	Welty
Drukker	Johnson, Ky.	Price	Wise
Dupré	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ragsdale	Wood, Ind.
Estopinal	Kahn	Roberts	
		Rowland	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.  
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.  
 Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. WARD.  
 Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. BORLAND with Mr. GOOD.  
 Mr. GANDY with Mr. CURRY of California.  
 Mr. THOMAS with Mr. DAVIDSON.  
 Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. DRUKKER.  
 Mr. BRAND with Mr. CARY.  
 Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. GOODALL.  
 Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. KREIDER.  
 Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.  
 Mr. CARLIN with Mr. MEEKER.  
 Mr. GARD with Mr. HAYES.  
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.  
 Mr. DENT with Mr. KAHN.  
 Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.  
 Mr. DIES with Mr. COPLEY.  
 Mr. KEHOE with Mr. MILLER of Washington.  
 Mr. DUPRE with Mr. GOULD.  
 Mr. LEE of California with Mr. MOTT.  
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. FESS.  
 Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. PRATT.  
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. FORDNEY.  
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. POWERS.  
 Mr. SCHALL with Mr. ROBERTS.  
 Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. TEMPLETON.  
 Mr. SISSON with Mr. VOLSTEAD.  
 Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.  
 Mr. WEBB with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.  
 Mr. WELTY with Mr. ROWLAND.  
 Mr. WISE with Mr. VARE.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9414, with Mr. CARAWAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9414, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Under the rule adopted on March 21 two measures were made in order as parts of this bill. Both of those two measures have been considered by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and they both contain paragraphs which are headed as sections. In the rule as printed in the Record the sections are not numbered, but the various sections of each measure are grouped together and each group is paragraphed 1 and 2. My inquiry is, In considering parts of the bill, will they be considered by sections in each of the two parts or will they be considered as one section for each measure?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, there is some doubt in my own mind as to whether under the rule the amendment that was offered, which contains two or three sections, can properly be considered as one section in the bill, and I will therefore change my amendment so that the sections in the bill will be considered in the order in which they appear and are numbered in the original bill. For instance, we will take up the section on the

motor trucks, and then the section on aviation, and then the proposition on the postal employees.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I was unfortunate enough not to have heard the gentleman's remarks when the bill was first taken up for consideration, and I do not know whether or not he devoted any considerable time to explaining these two bills that were made in order. Is it his intention to devote some time now to discussing or explaining the measures in a general way?

Mr. MOON. These two bills were put on in the Committee on Rules for the purpose of being considered with the main bill, H. R. 9414, as amended. We have completed the original bill and have come to the first amendment authorized by the Committee on Rules. In the bill as it was brought into the House and approved by the Committee on Rules the motor truck was the first section, and then the aviation section, and then came the independent section of the postal matter. I had moved to consider them all as one section, but if it is desired by the House to do otherwise—and it may be done more speedily that way—we can take them up one at a time.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is satisfactory.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman, I think, may have misunderstood my inquiry. I wished to inquire whether the gentleman now intends to make any remarks touching these two important measures in the nature of explanation or general debate, or whether he has heretofore done so?

Mr. MOON. I want the House to have a full explanation of this section. I have no objection to reasonable debate.

Mr. WALSH. My inquiry went more to the intention of the gentleman to make at this time more extended remarks on these two subjects.

Mr. MOON. I am going to offer an amendment to the first section, and then, with the consent of the House, I would like to have the statement of the department, which goes into detail in every particular, read.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Before the chairman of the committee takes his seat, I think it will be understood, first, that these various paragraphs, including one in this and one in the other, ought to be separately numbered.

Mr. MOON. That is the suggestion I made.

Mr. TOWNER. Now, in order that that may be done and without changing the proposition as now presented, I think it would be proper for the chairman of the committee to ask that they be considered by unanimous consent as separate paragraphs.

Mr. MOON. That is what I asked. Mr. Chairman, I ask that these sections, all of them made in order to be introduced as amendments, be treated as sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the amendments, made in order by special rule, be offered as paragraphs, each paragraph treated as a section. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first section.

Mr. MOON. Let the Clerk report the motor-truck section first.

The CHAIRMAN. It was read for information yesterday, as the RECORD shows. It is being offered now for amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will permit, last evening the Clerk read the first paragraph and was about to read the second when he was interrupted by a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just instructed the Clerk to read the first paragraph for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That to promote the conservation of food products and to facilitate the collection and delivery thereof from producer to consumer and the delivery of articles necessary in the production of such food products to the producers, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of motor-vehicle truck routes in the vicinity of such cities of the United States as he may select, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and the cost of such experiments, not exceeding \$300,000, may be paid by the Postmaster General out of any unexpended appropriations of the Postal Service, and the Postmaster General shall report the result of such experiments to the Congress at the earliest practicable date.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] has an amendment that he wanted to offer to the first section.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the first section. The lines in the bill are not the same as those in the amendment, but the Clerk will find, about the middle of the third line from the bottom of the page, the place where I offer this amendment. That is, after the word "service," insert the following: "Provided, That the Postmaster General may use the revenue derived from this experimental motor-vehicle truck

service to establish and maintain additional motor-vehicle truck routes, and to provide for the purchase of vehicles and operating expenses thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOON: Insert after the word "service" the following: "Provided, That the Postmaster General may use the revenue derived from this experimental motor-vehicle truck service to establish and maintain additional motor-vehicle truck routes and to provide for the purchase of vehicles and operating expenses thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee want to be heard on his amendment?

Mr. MOON. I hardly think it is necessary to be heard on it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. MOON. If there is any opposition to this amendment I want to say that this is purely an experimental service, that the department believes it will accomplish good results, and that instead of bringing a loss it will bring a substantial revenue to the Government. Of course the amount authorized for this experimental service is small. Standing alone it would accomplish good in proportion to the sum that is authorized, but the department suggests—and this amendment is a departmental suggestion—that for the extension of the service the revenues that may be derived from it may be used in the enlargement of the service for the benefit of the public. That will accomplish the desire of the department in trying to make effective a system by which the cities will be connected with the country and the country with the cities in the distribution of the products of the farm and of the merchandise from the cities, so that they will find it mutually beneficial.

There is a vast portion of our country that is not reached by railroads and other common carriers of traffic that can be reached speedily and readily by the motor truck. It has been estimated that there are hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of farm products that are not brought to the cities, because of the fact that they are on various farms along the road in such small quantities that it is hardly worth the while of the farmer to quit his work upon the farm and lose a day in carrying these products to the city, and yet, although small in amount at any one place, when taken together they constitute a vast amount of food. They can be sent on motor trucks at very small cost to the farmer—one-half of a cent per pound—and with practically no loss to the Government, and the people of the cities can have the benefit of a very much larger amount of food than they now have. Surely it must be conceded that at the present time there is in the cities and towns of our country a dearth of food, that food is very costly, and that this additional supply brought in and placed upon the market, in addition to that which is brought through the general channels of transportation, will so enlarge the supply of food products as to bring down the price to the consumers in the cities, and in the same way the products of the city may go to the farm. That is the general purpose of this provision, and I think that it very well and properly carries out the purpose.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MOON. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman know about how far from the cities the Postmaster General contemplates sending these trucks?

Mr. MOON. I do not know how far from the cities, but they might go a hundred miles. There has been a very intelligent statement in detail of the purposes of this provision and the effect of it and the cost of it. I will not undertake to state from memory all that has been said upon the subject, but a little later on I will ask that there be read from the Clerk's desk the statement of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General on the subject, in which he goes into all the details as to the cost of the service, and the benefits that may be derived from it, and the ultimate value of the service without ultimate loss to the Government. The same statement was printed as an exhibit to my remarks made a few days since.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. I have already referred to this bill, and I criticized it. I am not opposed to the principle of the Government undertaking the transportation of farm products and parcels, but I think it ought to be done so as not to encumber the other mail. The statements of the department officials published by me the other day show that the parcel post is impeding the first-class mail. The two ought to be separated, and, in my opinion, the Post Office Department ought to go further than this proposition, and establish a sort of express-package busi-



ness and keep it separate, so as not to interfere with the high-class mails.

This amendment is a most vicious proposition. The constitution provides that no money shall be taken out of the Treasury except pursuant to appropriation by Congress. Here is money collected by the department, which the department wants reappropriated, for use in a temporary experiment. It seems to me that is a vicious practice. They can carry on this experiment and determine whether it is a success without this authority.

Perhaps it will be a success. I do not know. I hope so. But if it is a success they do not need extraordinary authority. They can come to Congress at the next session and get all the money that is required. This is a very dangerous thing to do in the way that it is proposed. We have done it a few times in case of emergency, but certainly there is no emergency existing here that authorizes the Post Office Department to collect revenue and then use it over again for this experimental purpose. This is not a regular postal activity. It is considered simply an experiment in the transportation of articles growing on the farms, bringing them to the city, and bringing to the farmer the things that he gets from the city. It will never be a success unless you do it under different conditions than it is proposed to be done here. It should not be done under fixed rates of postage. If you want to make it a success, they ought to do as an express company does and establish a reasonable rate to meet the rates of competitors. Now, everybody knows that the express companies are using the post office for the purpose of transporting unprofitable business, and where the haul is profitable they take it themselves. With fixed rates of postage that can not be avoided. If you are going to make this movement from the farm to the consumer in the cities and back again to the farm a success, you ought to establish a regular package-freight business. If you then transfer the parcel post to a separate bureau, the two will work together, and you will not hamper the first-class mail.

There is room for an extension of Government authority, but it should be broad and well throughout. We should not only utilize motor trucks and highways, but trolley lines, railroads, and water routes, and establish terminals to transact the business as a separate activity from the regular mail.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am opposed to this amendment. The Post Office Department in recent years endeavored to establish a so-called parcel post "from the farm to the table" movement. I wanted to inquire of the gentleman who has just taken his seat, what has been the success of that project?

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman inquire of me?

Mr. HELM. If the gentleman knows, I should like to have the information right quick.

Mr. STEENERSON. All I know is that I have read laudatory descriptions of it in periodicals, which have advertised it without expense to the department.

Mr. HELM. I know that in a general way, in the large cities like Cincinnati, Washington, Baltimore, Louisville, and places of that kind, a systematic effort was undertaken through the parcel post to bring the farm in touch with the table, but I do not think it amounted to much, and this is a worse proposition than that.

But that is a little side issue. In the present condition of our country, when we are in the throes of the most gigantic war, to be piddling and delving into every little experiment of this kind and of every nature is absolutely preposterous, to my way of thinking. My mind may be an abnormal one—

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. No; I can not yield. We are going to divert \$300,000 into this kind of a scheme, we are going to install self-operating telephones, and flying-machine postal service, and every new-fangled scheme and project that can be hatched up right here in war times, when the money ought to be used for war purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And for Garabeds.

Mr. HELM. Yes; and for "Garabeds," as if there was no bottom to the Treasury of the United States. I know how futile it is for men to get up here and make this kind of a talk. I might just as well speak against a cliff, but, gentlemen, here is the last edition of a Washington paper, and one of the headlines says, "Defeat, but not disaster." The conditions in France ought to be at this time a sort of "stop, look, and listen" signal, which should be right above the Speaker's desk, so that every Member could see it and cause you to pause. Here you are rushing headlong as if you were on a joy ride, with the bars down. You take another plunge into the Treasury. France is being overrun to-day. It is a vital question as to whether this drive can be stopped or not. Can you not see that our re-

sponsibility is growing and expanding at an accelerating ratio every second? More man power is going to be demanded of us. This means more money; it means more expenditures of every kind; yet here we are like a lot of schoolboys picking up every newfangled proposition that is handed to us, and we vote for it like a lot of young birds with their mouths open, while the mother bird perches on a limb with a worm in her bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Yes; if the gentleman wants a worm, I will give him one.

Mr. LANGLEY. I think the gentleman is fully equipped for scattering that sort of product [laughter], but that is not my purpose in interrupting the gentleman. My purpose is to ask him if the object of this amendment is not to facilitate the transportation of farm products?

Mr. HELM. Foreign or farm products?

Mr. LANGLEY. Farm products, whether for foreign or domestic purposes. Our soldiers, as well as the people of the cities, have to be supplied with food. If that is the purpose of this proposition—to facilitate the transportation of farm products—how can it be so inadvisable as the gentleman states?

Mr. HELM. Is there a road in the gentleman's district where one of these trucks could run? [Laughter.] Before you could use one of these trucks in your district you would have to build a road.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that? Yes; they could run in mine and in his, too. My district adjoins his, and I know personally that there are more mud-holes in his district than there are in mine. [Laughter.]

Mr. HELM. My district does not adjoin the gentleman's district by 50 miles. Is my time exhausted, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has half a minute more.

Mr. HELM. Gentlemen, if you have a serious thought about this war, if you are on the fighting side of this war, instead of on the money-making side, then I submit to you that you ought to stop, look, and listen. The sooner the American people get on the fighting side of this war issue instead of on the money-grabbing side of it and the money-making side of it the better.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELM. It is absolutely true that the rural carriers and the city delivery men are having a harder time in making buckle and tongue meet than ever before, but every man, woman, and child in the United States of America is having precisely the same difficulty. What is true of the rural carrier and the city carrier and the postal clerk is true of every human being in the United States. They have precisely the same difficulties to meet as the rural carrier and the city clerk and the postmaster, and this is a time when everyone has to share his part of the load, when every man, woman, and child in the United States has got to feel the pinch of this war. The office-holding class in the United States is not the only class to be looked after and to be safeguarded and surrounded with comforts and luxuries to make life easier and happier to them. The man who is entitled to some consideration at our hands is the man who has to go down into his jeans and dig up a part of the tax to pay the war expense and also the salaries of the office-holding classes, and you gentlemen ought to let that sink into you. The country is at war. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, if there is any merit in any proposition, it is in this, because this provision seeks to reduce the cost of living; it does not seek to make any money for anybody. It seeks to put the consumer in touch with the producer through the postal department, and we are proposing here to appropriate \$300,000, to be placed at the disposal of the Postmaster General, to make an experiment as to whether or not it is feasible and practical to remove the food supply from its place of origin to its place of consumption without having to go through the middleman. This might properly be termed a war measure, for in its execution it is proposed to relieve the burden of the ordinary man by reducing the cost of living. While we are making the experiment we ought to take advantage of all that we receive from the sale of supplies and use that to extend the service to a larger number of people. The people who live in the great cities of the country should have the advantage of a service such as this section proposes, if the Post Office Department can prove the practicability of such a service; and I maintain that, if we are to give the Postmaster General the power to experiment at all, we ought to give him that power to its fullest extent. He can not exercise the power

to its fullest extent unless he be given the right to use the receipts from the sale of the farm products in the form of a revolving fund.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is there anything in this provision to authorize the Government to sell farm produce?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, we bring it in and we make a charge for the service, which amounts to the same thing; and all that we receive from the charge we make, over and above the cost of the service, should be used for the extension of the service.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOON. If the gentleman will yield right there, because perhaps the House will not want all of this report read, I want to remind him that the Post Office Department in making this estimate upon a route of a hundred miles, 50 miles each way, in calculating the expense of the whole year on 2,000 pounds at the parcel-post rate, \$10 for 313 days a year, estimates it would yield \$3,130; but the operating of vehicles to convey half a ton each way is \$1,740.15 and the expense account is \$1,200 a year of the carrier, so at the lowest estimate the profit will be \$189.85.

Mr. MADDEN. So that if we have a profit from all of these routes and we use the funds derived from that profit to extend the service so that it can be granted to more people, if that be done, and if there is any surplus, and if at the end of the year it can be shown that the service is a valuable service; that it is performing the function that it was intended to perform; that it has put the consumer and the producer in touch with each other; that it has reduced the cost of living; that it has proved to be a service in which the Government should engage—

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Then we ought to continue the service. In just a moment—and if at the end of the period of experimentation—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. I ask that the gentleman have one minute additional, as I desire to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may speak one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. HAMLIN. Make it three minutes. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks that the gentleman from Illinois be permitted to speak for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield to me? I got him the extension of time.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me complete the sentence. If at the end of the period of experimentation the department is not able to show that it is entitled to the expenditure of an additional sum, then the routes can be discontinued. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. But does the gentleman consider who would pay this profit? Somebody must pay it if the Government makes it.

Mr. MADDEN. I presume the consumer would pay the difference between the Government operation and the sum received for the operation.

Mr. BRITTEN. He pays it now.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. And how is that going to reduce the cost of living if he has got to pay this great profit to the Government to get his produce into town?

Mr. MADDEN. Quite a different proposition from that which now obtains. The farmer to-day produces and then he employs agencies to remove his product to the consumer. Does he move that production to the consumer directly? Not at all. He moves it to the place where some middleman is employed and the middleman then has got to pay a storage charge, clerical force; he has to charge a profit for his own service, and sometimes it is advanced 100 per cent on the original cost.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Just one more question.

Mr. MADDEN. Just a moment. Whereas the Government of the United States proposes only to charge the difference between the cost of the operation of his vehicle and price he charges for the use of the vehicle, which is a very nominal difference.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield to me? I think my question will answer the interrogatory also of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING]. Does the gentleman know a very late Member of this House, a very active and honored Mem-

ber of this House, made a statement before a committee of this House of which I am a member right upon this point? He went out to Maryland about 25 miles and bought, I think, \$5 worth of produce—eggs, butter, and so forth—and let it come into the city in the ordinary way and go through the middle man—following it, however, to the consumer—and that \$5 worth of produce actually cost the consumer \$11 and something.

Mr. MADDEN. I can understand that very well.

Mr. HAMLIN. Whereas, to come by parcel post it would only cost about 50 cents.

Mr. MADDEN. It is to do away with that that we propose this experimentation, and if we can prove that we have saved 10 per cent over and above the present cost, we then have the right to claim that we have done a service worth while.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. WALSH. How much does the gentleman expect we are going to do away with on a \$300,000 scale?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, we do not expect to be able to serve all the American people, but we do expect possibly to prove from the experiment that we are able to reduce the cost or that we are not able to reduce it. But the main question is, Is it worth while to spend \$300,000 if by the expenditure of that money we may be able to do some good?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I shall consume the five minutes of time. I can not believe that the three days of debate on this bill has been sincere. It strikes me as a very inopportune time for the Congress of the United States to devote three days of debate to increase of salaries when the world is burning up at this moment. Nero fiddled while Rome was on fire, and it strikes me that that is exactly what this Congress is doing now. With war bills of great and tremendous importance upon the calendar awaiting passage, with a bill on the calendar now, passed out of the Committee on Agriculture, proposing to furnish the farmers \$9,000,000 with which to buy seed this spring, every pressure being brought to bear upon the farmers to increase their products this summer, and yet those bills are not called up for consideration. And I have about made up my mind, without criticizing any particular one, that behind this filibuster here there must be an attempt to hold that bill appropriating \$9,000,000 for seed back from consideration. I am not able to understand it from any other conceivable viewpoint.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COX. I can not yield now.

Now is the time to sow wheat in the Northwest. Two weeks from now it will be entirely too late to buy seed wheat. If that bill was put through here, with \$9,000,000 made available to the Department of Agriculture, there is no doubt the wheat products would be multiplied by hundreds of thousands of acres in that northwest country. The farmers in my State, all over that great corn belt last year, got badly hit as the result of the frost. They are seeking to-day to find where they can buy reliable seed corn in order to plant corn this summer. And yet this bill, that every Member of this House that knows anything about it knows will never become a law in its present shape, will be headed off somewhere before it is time for it to become a law; but three days must be consumed on the floor of this House in order to increase the salaries of certain postal employees.

Now, I quite agree with the gentleman from Chicago that this present provision, in my opinion, is the best provision in the entire bill. Experimental though it is, we must remember that 20 or 22 years ago the whole question of rural-route mail was an experimental matter, which has developed to-day to a certainty. It took 30 years to force through Congress a parcel-post bill. Until six years ago we could send by parcel post cheaper from here to Tokio, Japan, than we could here from one street corner to another. But special interests held it back, all the time claiming that parcel post could not be operated satisfactorily in this country; and it never was forced through Congress until powerful and potential organizations, to wit, of the farmers and the laboring men got behind it and compelled Congress to pass it. The question of food supply to-day is very largely one of transportation. It is bringing the city fellow and the country fellow into close touch. This is an experiment pure and simple. It is the best provision in the entire bill. To-day there is an experimental line like this running from Indianapolis, Ind., to Louisville, Ky.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY and Mr. PLATT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] is recognized.



Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, experiment with these motor mail routes has already gone far enough in a tentative way to show that in many sections they are going to be a success, and are almost certain to be a success where the roads are good enough to give them a fair chance. It seems to me that this is no extravagant appropriation, nor is it extravagant to allow the use of the receipts in establishing new routes. These motor mail routes are established so that they cross the railroads generally. That is the idea of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, who is very enthusiastic in advocating them, and it is a good idea. If possible, he establishes them so that they cross the railroads instead of paralleling them, and they actually develop new business. They have an effect on the territory served like a trolley road running out into a suburban district. Such a trolley will develop a new residential district. The land out in the country is worth nothing for residence purposes until you make some way for the people to get into town from it. And in the same way you can make it advantageous for farmers to cultivate land which they are not cultivating now, when you give them an easy way to send their products into market. These motor trucks pick up parcels, eggs, chickens, and so forth, properly crated or packed along the route. A great deal of it will doubtless be picked up at the smaller post offices, but a great deal of it also will be picked up at crossroads and at farmhouses and when it reaches the cities it will be delivered directly to the consignees, most of it, without being handled at the post offices. It seems to me this is a project that deserves every encouragement at this time. Doubtless some extravagant statements have been made as to what these motor mail routes will accomplish in the way of winning the war, but that they will cause land to be cultivated that is not now cultivated I have not any doubt. They will bring a certain amount of farm produce that now goes by roundabout ways or not at all directly into the towns and will reestablish in some cases old trade lines which have been abandoned since the building of railroads. They will be a good thing for the farmers and a good thing for the cities.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Does not the gentleman believe that if you can by these motor trucks transport perishable foodstuffs to the cities you will thus enable us to ship more nonperishable foodstuffs for war purposes?

Mr. PLATT. I think there is some truth in that.

Mr. FARR. It would be a relief to the railroads.

Mr. PLATT. Not only that, but in a good many cases it will bring to the smaller post offices much better connections for first-class mail. There are a great many places where the railroads run on north and south lines into the great cities, or on east and west lines. Mail from towns only a few miles apart now has to go into the cities on one line and out on another. Motor mail routes will in many cases connect such towns directly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, there was an amendment offered and is pending. I do not want to close debate on the section now. I think it would be a very good thing to devote time on the amendment that is offered. I move that debate close in 10 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. I was informed that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] wanted to discuss that amendment for a few minutes.

Mr. MOON. Discuss what?

Mr. STEENERSON. Wanted to discuss this amendment about the revolving fund.

Mr. MOON. I would not have any objection if he desires to discuss it. I want to close debate on that amendment as soon as we can.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I want five minutes.

Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the committee, and I would like five minutes.

Mr. MOON. Will it be satisfactory to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STERLING] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] to take five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. What was the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MOON. I will ask that all debate close on this particular amendment in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this particular pending amendment close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. I do not mean by that that the debate shall close on the motor-truck section, but that the debate shall close on the amendment offered to the amendment. The discussion will be extended on the motor-truck section.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I reserve the right to object. What is that amendment?

Mr. MOON. To the effect that the money is to be used as a revolving fund.

Mr. LEVER. Has the gentleman in mind how much time he will take on this section?

Mr. MOON. I can not possibly tell how long these gentlemen want to talk. I do not want to close them off too soon, but it seems to me this debate should close in half an hour.

Mr. LEVER. I desire to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that there is a rather important bill on the calendar from the Committee on Agriculture, which, if passed at all, ought to be passed very early. I understand that the Committee on Rules is ready to report a rule for its immediate consideration. The rule has been ordered reported out of the committee for some time.

While this matter is an exceedingly important matter, I still rather agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] that we have spent three whole days talking about whether a fourth-class postmaster ought to get \$80 or get \$85 a year. It seems to me that there ought to be some close to this, in order that other legislation, more important legislation, may be taken up. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. POU. The gentleman from Tennessee having yielded, I want to say to the House and to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that a rule providing for the consideration of the matter to which the gentleman from South Carolina referred is ready to be presented immediately after this bill is disposed of.

Mr. LEVER. I knew that, and therefore I made the statement to the House.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman should not be in too great a hurry about that. I am going to amend my motion, or withdraw the motion I made, and ask that all debate on this section and the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have been seeking recognition for some time.

Mr. MOON. I did not ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman. I know I can not get that. I make the motion. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGLEY, Mr. TREADWAY, Mr. NORTON, and Mr. DEMPSEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STERLING] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, in the brief period of time allotted to me I shall urge the adoption by the committee of the amendment proposed by Judge Moon, of Tennessee, to that section of the bill which authorizes experiments in motor-truck delivery and also undertake to show to the committee the wisdom of adopting, when so amended, the section which is in itself being considered by the Committee of the Whole House as an amendment to the pending bill by virtue of the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and approved.

What is the substance of the section Judge Moon proposes to amend and what is the nature of that amendment? The section provides that the Postmaster General shall expend a sum, not exceeding \$300,000, to conduct experiments in the operation of motor-vehicle truck routes, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and between such points or cities of the Nation as he may select.

The Moon amendment provides, in substance, that whatever profits are derived from the experiment, namely the operation of motor-truck routes, may be used by the Postmaster General for the further extension and advancement of the motor-truck delivery system.

Who is there to contend, if this experiment shows a substantial profit, that the plan should not be extended and enlarged? And who is there to contend, if the experiment proves beneficial and helpful to the Nation and to the people, in the present emergency, that the motor-truck delivery system should not be encouraged and supported?

The purpose of the proposed experiment is to determine if such plan will promote a conservation of food products, facilitate a collection and delivery thereof from the producer to the

consumer, and also provide a means of delivery to the producer of those articles necessary and essential to food production.

The cry of our Nation in the present world crisis is that men, ships, and guns will win the war. This same slogan may be said to be the belief of every nation on earth fighting for the maintenance of free government and against the advancement of the military propaganda of the Hun.

Let me say to the committee that in the assembling of the man power of the world for this contest, in the preparation for the construction of ships and the manufacture of guns, there are two primary essentials first to be considered, and those are food and fuel. The men assembled and selected for military purposes are dependent upon the production of sufficient foodstuffs to sustain and support them, and they are equally dependent on the fuel of the Nation to operate and run the industries and manufacturing establishments organized to turn out the ships, the guns, and all war equipment. The industries of the country will become useless unless there is produced and transported to the seats of industry the proper quantities of coal and coke.

The civilian population of the Nation, a great portion of which is found in the centers of population—the large cities and industrial communities—will be found in many instances far from the fields of agricultural development and the production of foodstuffs.

Food and fuel will win the war. It must not only be produced, but arrangements must be made to transport the foodstuffs and the fuel to the places where it is most needed. This duty will fall to the American people. It is imperative. It should and must be encouraged by the National Government. This is no time to quibble about the expense; it is necessary and must be done.

This Government nor its citizenship, the taxpayers, will ever be able to estimate the loss in men and money occasioned by the delays brought about by the unprepared conditions, in power and equipment, of the railroad systems of the country when the present war situation was forced upon us.

The man power of the Nation has already been diverted from the usual avocations of life into two fields, both closely identified with the military preparation. First, 2,000,000 and more of the best man power of the country are now trained for military service in the field of battle. Second, more of the productive man power has been encouraged to engage in that class of labor directly allied with the preparation of the war program; that is, by working in the mines, the munition factories, the shipyards, and all other industries engaged in the construction and manufacture of war equipment.

In my judgment, there will soon necessarily be a diversion of a large portion of the civilian population of the country to special fields of industry. It may be necessary to take the unemployed from the centers of population to the agricultural fields of production in order that we may produce the necessary foodstuffs to support not only the men in the military service, but also to feed the very large number of our people located in the big cities of the country and in the industrial sections of the Nation, where the production of farm and agricultural products has been made almost prohibitive by the high price of wage paid to the laboring man, whose service has been regarded as essential in the preparation of war equipment.

Without these necessary foodstuffs the soldier in the field will be unable to perform his service; without this necessary food in the large cities, centers of population, and industrial communities, there will become unrest, dissatisfaction, and serious conditions.

Therefore we must not only arrange to produce the fuel and the foodstuffs in abundant quantities, but we must also arrange, by every possible method of transportation, to carry that fuel and that foodstuff from the fields of production to the very places where it is needed to satisfy the requirements and the demands of the people.

The power and equipment of the railroad companies were found to be deficient. There may be, and there no doubt is, a better systematized arrangement for the use of the power and the equipment of the railway systems of the Nation under its present management, but who will contend that there has been sufficient opportunity to increase the power and the equipment so as to handle properly the fuel, the foodstuffs, and the war equipment so necessary in this emergency.

Whatever railroad power and equipment can be saved from the transportation of foodstuffs to the centers of population and industrial communities by adopting any other means or method of transportation will make available the use of that railroad power and equipment for the transportation of fuel—coal and coke—to the seats of industry, to the centers of population, for industrial and domestic purposes. In other words,

the States of West Virginia, Illinois, and Pennsylvania produce more than 60 per cent of the coal produced annually in the United States, and large sections of these States formerly engaged in the production of agricultural products are now almost entirely engaged in the production of coal and coke, and many thousands of people living in these industrial communities are dependent for their foodstuffs on other sections of the country.

Railroad power and equipment, deficient though it may be, must without other preparation, be used to carry food to these people to feed and sustain them while they labor to produce the fuel so much needed by the Nation. If this railroad power or equipment can be saved, or any portion of it, why not proceed to the necessity?

I assume to make the statement, that if there could be furnished to the sections of the country where is found the valuable deposits of coal, sufficient railroad power and equipment to transport the greatest possible production capable of the man power now engaged in that industry, that much of the necessity for the regulation of coal and coke prices would be removed, and the domestic and industrial needs of the country properly supplied.

The coal and coke operators, in at least a portion of the Pennsylvania district which I have the honor to represent in this Congress—and it is one of the leading coal and coke producing districts of the Nation—are already making preparation to meet the food situation as best they can. Many of the operators of Fayette County, Pa., have purchased thousands of dollars' worth of tractors, seed, and food materials for garden purposes. They have arranged to give the laboring man sections of land to plant and cultivate, furnishing to him the seed and material, with the understanding that he has the benefit of the crops and foodstuffs raised therefrom, and this is all done for the purpose of meeting any possible scarcity of food, and handling any possible condition of disquiet and discontent. These men will do their best, and while the mines and men are idle on account of transportation facilities they will labor in the gardens being now provided.

These extend into and through at least four of the most important counties in southwestern Pennsylvania for the production of coal and coke two highways of recognized national reputation. The Lincoln Highway would open up to the coal fields of southwestern Pennsylvania the great agricultural county of Lancaster, in Pennsylvania, and, through the great agricultural Cumberland Valley, the old National Road extends. These particular agricultural sections, and all of the agricultural lands between these sections and the coal region, would furnish a means of providing foodstuffs to the industrial regions of western Pennsylvania and the large cities thereof if properly organized, and thereby save the railroad power hereinbefore referred to. Like lines of communication could be established elsewhere in the Nation.

There are 156,000 miles of improved hard-surfaced highways in the United States. Important mail matter and valuable food products could be collected and delivered by means of motor vehicles along these highways, so that a distance of at least 80 miles may be covered in a period of 12 hours. I believe that the earning power of the system will exceed the cost. But, after all, the present emergency requires additional methods of transportation for these essential articles. The Post Office Department, gentlemen of the committee, has already in a small way undertaken this character of service. I read to you, and will have placed in the Record, a statement of postage, weight, and cost covering a period of six days in the present month on Government-owned motor-truck routes.

On the route established between Baltimore and Oxford the postage on first and fourth class matter amounted to \$62.37; the total weight of pounds carried, 749½; and the cost of maintenance, \$63.

And now I call your attention to the postage, weight, and cost of six other routes. The first item in each instance will be the postage received by the Government for the carriage of first and fourth class mail matter, the second item the weight, and the third item the cost:

Route.	Postage.	Weight.	Cost.
Baltimore-Mount Airy.....	\$475.73	7,940	\$54.33
Hagerstown-Mount Airy.....	198.35	2,124	74.52
Baltimore-Gettysburg.....	355.67	4,328	59.04
Lancaster-Gettysburg.....	203.82	1,866	67.80
Baltimore-Solomons.....	1,120.55	12,427½	127.50
Philadelphia-Oxford.....	645.66	17,718	145.08

And further, gentlemen of the committee, on Wednesday, March 20, this year, a motor truck left Lancaster, Pa., for New York City, a distance of 180 miles or thereabout. It carried



approximately 3,000 pounds of parcel-post matter, and reached its place of destination in a running time of 12 hours. The postage derived from this trip amounted to \$31.60, and the direct expense thereof approximately \$10—\$4 for a driver, \$6 for gas.

The parcel-post matter embraced 4,000 1-day-old chicks, Easter season; 200 pounds of honey; 500 pounds of smoked sausage; 500 pounds of butter; and 18,000 eggs. When the consignment was turned over to the consignee, 9 eggs were found to be broken in transit and 2 chicks had died.

On the same day the same man in Lancaster shipped 28,800 eggs to the same consignee by express, and approximately 10,000 eggs of that consignment were destroyed by rough handling in course of transit.

It seems to me that the character of legislation embraced within the subject now under discussion must not only be considered in the nature of an experiment, but rather in the nature of a necessity. I hope that the amendment offered by Judge Moon after this section will be adopted, and that the section itself will then be adopted by the committee as one of the outstanding and important features of the legislative enactment now before the House.

I desire, briefly, to refer to other sections of the bill, providing for the increase of pay to rural carriers and postal employees. There has been pronounced criticism by a few Members of the House against the character of this legislation. Certain prominent Members, distinguished for their ability and legislative experience, have referred to this measure as an unwarranted raid on the Treasury of the United States, and others have classed it as pork-barrel legislation. Long before I ever expected to have the honor of a seat in the Congress of the United States I very frequently read of Treasury raids by the Congress and of "pork-barrel legislation." In times past allegations have been repeatedly made, regardless of what political party was in power. I do not believe this legislation to be in the nature of pork-barrel legislation, and if it is, no more equitable distribution has ever been made by a legislative body. This proposed increase of wage directly benefits more than 250,000 American citizens. It helps to reestablish and make more efficient the mail service of the country, a service that was inaugurated and has constantly been improved, for the purpose of bringing into closer relationship the commercial life, the business interests, and the people operating and living in one community or State with those in another community or State.

A few years ago the people living in rural communities were afforded an opportunity to carry on correspondence relative to their commercial and business interests with other sections of their county, State, and Nation by going to fourth-class post-offices which had been established by the Government, and to which offices the mail was carried by contractual agreement. Then the Government, through the Post Office Department, seeing the necessity of making a still closer relationship between the people and the business interests, provided a more efficient service by establishing the rural route, until the rural carriers of the country reached annually in this Nation 28,000,000 of its population.

This closer relationship of people, business, and the commercial life of the Nation was further benefited by the establishment of the parcel-post system along these many, many rural routes, and when that great benefit was placed within the reach of the people of this Nation they quickly took advantage of it and established their lines of communication for business and commercial purposes throughout each of the communities, and reaching from community to State and from one State to another. To-day many of these important rural routes have become disabled and inefficient, in fact abandoned entirely, because the carrier is unable to support himself and his family, feed and care for his horses and keep up his equipment and provide for a replacement of the equipment necessary to carry on his business on the salary he now receives. The fact is he has left the rural-carrier route and sought better wages in other fields of industry, and was forced to do it to meet the increased cost of the necessities of life for the support of himself and his family. It has prevented the circulation of the important loyal newspapers of the country to a vast portion of the Nation's loyal citizenship. This citizenship must be kept in close touch, it must be forewarned against the enemy propaganda, and 28,000,000 of the country's population must not be placed beyond the reach of this educational influence. The fourth-class post office can not in this emergency be reestablished where the rural route has taken its place.

In the district which I represent the rural-carrier service is almost hopelessly disorganized. Farmers and laboring men have formed committees and selected one man out of a com-

munity to furnish the equipment and deliver the mail for a period covering a week at a time, and then another would substitute and take his place, to the end that all of the patrons of that route would be served. I have tried to have young men, intelligent, bright boys, placed at this work, but have been confronted with a departmental ruling from the Civil Service Commission that no boy under 17 years of age may be a substitute carrier and no boy under 18 years of age may be a permanent rural carrier. This, to me, is a ruling that at least for the present should be suspended. I am unable to see why an American boy, physically and mentally fit to perform the service of keeping intact the lines of communication established by the rural-carrier system, is not competent for that position, when it was the argument, I am told, by the Army Staff, that such character of American manhood was physically and mentally fit to enter the military service of the Nation to fight the trained Prussian military advancement.

The Government can not afford to have this great mail system fail to properly function in this emergency. If there is no other way to maintain these lines of communication in their efficiency, some substantial increase of payment must be made. The rural carriers and the postal employees are entitled to an increase on their own account, and the efficiency of the mail system of the country requires that the line of communication be always open and always working.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to supplement the statement that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STERLING] has just made by giving the aggregate of the expenses and postal receipts of the six routes to which he refers. The total weight carried over those six experimental routes was 15,236 pounds. The actual cost of operation, maintenance, overhead charges, depreciation of the trucks, and so forth, was \$386.22. The total postage received was \$2,417.49, a profit of seven times the actual cost. These figures represent six days' operation during the present month. It seems to me that is a very excellent governmental experiment. As a rule, experiments are mighty expensive. Here is an experiment that is making money for the Government, and it is right and fair that that experimental profit should be used for the continuation of the experiment and the extension of the effort to establish these motor-truck routes through farming districts. I disagree absolutely with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] who said that the debate on this bill had not been sincere, that we were trying to choke off some other legislation. Has there been anything more sincere than the effort that this House has made during the past three days to better the condition of the Postal Service men in this country? I think it has been time well spent and money well invested. [Applause.]

This proposition comes right home to another class of our people. My district is partially a farming community in western Massachusetts, adjoining a section of Connecticut and near to a section of New York, portions as inaccessible as any sections in those respective States. The farms are being depopulated, farming is dying out, and all for lack of accessibility to the markets. This sort of service will provide for farming communities means of reaching market centers. The establishment of a motor route through the section to which I refer, which will put into communication with the market the sort of country where we are appealing to the people to better the farming conditions, to produce more and to bring it to the market for consumption both here and abroad, is one of the most useful propositions in which the Government can engage. I have seen nothing in the way of service to the people of the country that promises more than this move to establish motor routes. The deserted farm in our country has been a very serious question. Our State legislature has for a long time had that problem before it. Our State board of agriculture has been greatly exercised over it. It is not because the farming community is a poor one. It is the richest possible kind of a farming section, but the very fact of the inaccessibility of the market is what prevents its production being brought up to its highest standard. So give the farmer this chance, experiment in just such a section of the country as that, and it will redound both to the profit of the country and to the amount of production of the farm. I am sincerely interested in the passage both of the amendment suggested and the amendment to it that the chairman of the committee has proposed. It is proper that the profit shown in this experiment of 7 to 1 over the cost should be used for a continuation of the experiment. [Applause.]

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. I should like to say to the gentleman that I live in a farming community, and so far as I have been able to learn no farmer has suggested this proposition to me. I doubt the feasibility of it myself very much.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will say that no farmer in my section has suggested it. It would perhaps be the last thing that the farmer might think of proposing, but we want to offer to bring it to him rather than wait for him to ask to have it brought to him.

The farmers are much exercised over the men who have been called to the service and the great difficulty of securing necessary farm help to take their places. By adoption of motor routes, instead of being obliged to take a considerable portion of time to carry produce to market, it can be loaded onto motor trucks and delivered to the centers in much less time than over the usual means of communication and in much better condition.

Take, for illustration, a shipment of a case of eggs. If loaded on a truck no handling is required until delivery in the market. If sent by any other way, from inaccessible sections, the number of times the case would be handled is problematical. Butter, berries, milk, and every perishable commodity of the farm can be handled better and quicker in this manner than under existing conditions. It opens a very wide field of improvement in farming methods, and I bespeak for the rural communities I represent the favorable consideration of the House for the pending measure. Further than this, it is not like many forms of legislation, entailing large expense. The experiments have been carried sufficiently far to prove the service will be profitable as well as very beneficial.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, this is a war measure if ever there was one introduced in any legislative body in the world. It is not merely a matter of saving in the cost of distribution which this legislation seeks to attain. We know that if we win this war we must conserve food, man power, and motive power. This bill looks to a better utilization of the vegetable-producing energy of this country. As stated by my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], in proportion as we can increase the use of vegetables in this country we will remove the burden from the grain and meat crops of this country and make possible a greater exportation of those products. There is nothing that can utilize the odds and ends of time and labor as vegetable production can utilize them. Let us see what is the situation. These food commodities are produced in the country. Somebody must get them to market. The practical, common-sense proposition that presents itself to a Congress engaged in guiding a country in the conduct of a great war is, Can we conserve man power by having one man drive a truck over 50 miles and gather up the products of the farms along those 50 miles instead of having each farmer along that 50-mile route hitch up his own conveyance, take his own time, and undertake to get his commodity to the market? I submit that it is common sense to send somebody around with a vehicle that can gather up from these farms the vegetables and other small parcels of food products which they want to send to market, and let the farmer stay at home, continue the day's work, and raise more food to help win the war. That is practical common sense.

Another thing. If we properly utilize this service we will establish distribution routes in the cities. When these trucks enter the city, instead of going to the post office and having to clear through the post office the products brought in, they will take these commodities over the delivery routes, and the people in the cities can get on their tables that evening the commodities that were gathered fresh from the farms in the morning. And in proportion as you can get these wholesome, fresh vegetables to the table of the city man at a price freed from a multiplicity of profits and which puts no limit upon the amount that he can afford to buy, you will indirectly increase the amount of exportable grain and meat.

Besides, gentlemen, we have reached a point in this country where those of us who live in the cities must recognize the fact that in the price we pay for what we eat we must stand the overhead charges upon distribution. We not only must pay the overhead charges upon distribution, but those of us who buy vegetables and eat them must pay for the vegetables that rot in the field. You know, as a matter of common sense, that a farmer who has, say, one extra basket of beans above what is needed at home can not afford to hitch up his team and take those beans 8 or 10 miles to market, but if a man will come along driving a truck for the Government his wife can send those beans to somebody in the city. If those beans are not eaten by somebody in the city, they will rot in the field after they are produced—a food waste and an economic waste.

Then those of us who do eat beans must pay in the price we give for the beans we eat the value of those beans that rot in the field, which we never had a chance to buy. We must do that because agriculture must be put on a plane with every other calling. We have to pay the farmer as much net profit to stay on the farm as he can make if he goes to the factory.

That is the reason why you have been losing your population in New England. Agriculture has not been able to meet the bid of New England industry. Much of this back-to-the-farm-movement stuff is all rot. You might just as well go down here and haul the water out of the Potomac River up to Great Falls and empty it into the river there and expect it to stay as to put people on the farm, unless you make it just as profitable to farm as to engage in any other business in the world. Let us at least make an earnest intelligent test of this proposition, which seems to be practical and unquestionably is aimed in a right direction.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago in a friendly colloquy between my distinguished colleague, Mr. HELM, and myself I stated that my district adjoins his, and he said in reply that the boundary of my district does not come within 50 miles of his. I regret to have to advertise to the House the inaccuracy of his geographical information, and I would not do so but for the fact that I would leave myself in an attitude warranting the presumption that I am lacking in the same line of knowledge if I did not call attention to the fact that the county of Jackson, which is in my district, borders on the county of Madison, which is in his district. It was originally cut off from his district to the eleventh district, and later from the eleventh to the tenth district. Incidentally I might remark in passing that the Republican majority of Jackson County has greatly increased since it was cut off from his district, which warrants the inference, I think, that the county has profited by the transfer.

Mr. HELM. How long has that been taken out of the eleventh district?

Mr. LANGLEY. About six years. It was transferred to the eleventh many years ago and put into the tenth by the act of 1912.

Mr. HELM. That is one of the perambulating counties of the eleventh district.

Mr. LANGLEY. A Democratic legislature is responsible for whatever perambulating there may have been. I did not have anything to do with that.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is about the first time since I have been a Member of this body that I have at one and the same time agreed with both the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON]. When both of these distinguished statesmen, so radically different temperamentally and politically, come together on a proposition, it must be right. I shall support this amendment because I believe it is a step in the right direction, and I congratulate both of them upon the fact that they are showing a disposition to-day to be a little more generous toward the people in the rural districts than they exhibited yesterday. I regretted to see them throw their powerful influence against the effort we were making to aid the star-route carriers and the fourth-class postmasters, all of whom are greatly underpaid and sadly in need of congressional relief. The gentleman from Tennessee says that these motor trucks will probably go as far as a hundred miles from the city. That will help some, and it shows a tendency to depart from the custom which has prevailed too much heretofore of confining the large appropriations and the benefits of Federal aid generally to the large cities and their environs and neglecting the rural districts. There is another indication, which I am glad to see, that a little more consideration is being given to the people who live in the country.

During my many years of service here I have observed that, as a rule, the city chaps—excuse me, I mean city Members—do not seem to be able to see clearly beyond the corporate limits of their own municipality. I am glad to note that this mental astigmatism is gradually passing away, and the fact that the two distinguished gentlemen to whom I have referred both concur in this proposition to help the farmers a little bit is very gratifying to me as a country Member of Congress. Another healthy sign of the times that I have noticed lately is that we do not hear and read now, as we used to, so much facetious tommyrot about the sharpshooters of the mountains. We need them in this war. We do not hear and read so much as we used to about "Senator Sorghum" and "hayseed," about "Bitter Creek," "Podunk," and "Pumpkin Center." It is now becoming generally recognized that we need this class of our citizenship to produce the foodstuffs necessary to keep the city chaps from starving to death as well as to feed our soldiers. [Applause.]

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that when this proposition becomes a law that it will be so enforced by the Post Office Department as to carry out the purposes which Congress had in view in enacting it, and that it will be enforced in a more liberal spirit than has been the policy of that department with regard to the star-route carriers.

Some resentment has already been shown in this debate of criticism of the Post Office Department in this connection. I



have had a good deal of experience with that department, especially with regard to star routes, and I say to you that in my humble opinion Shylock of old, in the zenith of his unconscionable career, could not have been more merciless in his demand for his pound of flesh than has been the Post Office Department in insisting upon the literal enforcement of its contracts with regard to star routes, which are, in my opinion, the most one-sided contracts, that the Government was ever a party to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. I can not yield now. It is no answer to that to say that they are made and enforced in accordance with the laws enacted by Congress, because I know of innumerable cases where the work has increased to such an extent that it is absolutely cruel to insist upon the performance of the contract without additional compensation, which the department has it in its power to grant, and without permitting the reletting of the contract, which the department also has it in its power to do. It is no answer to this argument to say that a contractor ought not to be paid any more than his bid, for the simple reason that conditions have changed since the contract was made. The cost of living has increased enormously; the cost of equipment has increased; the cost of feed and of labor has increased, so that in many instances it actually costs practically twice as much to carry the mail as it did when the contract was entered into. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that I am digressing somewhat from the rules governing the debate under the five-minute rule, but the pressure for time yesterday was so great that I could not get an opportunity to say some things that I wanted to say about these star-route carriers, who are having such a hard time just now under these prevailing high prices. I wish I had the time to tell you gentlemen about some cases that have come under my personal observation. Why, Mr. Chairman, I know of cases where it is costing carriers almost twice as much as they are getting from the Government under their contract. There have been almost enough mountain mules and horses and buckboards put out of commission to supply the Quartermaster Department in the patriotic effort of these men to carry out their contract with the Government. It is unfair and unjust for the Government to refuse to give relief under such circumstances. We have increased the compensation of rural carriers and nearly all other classes of employees in the Postal Service, and it is a crying shame that this class of the Government's employees, who need relief more than any other class, apparently can not get it. I voted for all of these other increases, and yet when we ask for some specific relief for these star-route carriers we are met with a sort of indefinite proposition which is clothed with elastic language that might be construed— [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, during the debate that we have had upon this bill to increase the salaries of postal employees I have listened to so much ill-timed and unfounded criticism of the Post Office Department that I am tired of it and feel compelled to say a word in reply. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], who has just addressed the House, says that the policy of the Post Office Department in dealing with these star-route contractors is the policy of a shlylock. As a matter of fact, the Postmaster General has no right under the law to alter or modify these star-route and screen-wagon contracts, and the reason we have put this provision in the bill is at the suggestion of the Postmaster General, in order that he may have authority to investigate these cases and give relief in proper cases. There is no question but that there are some contractors now who are laboring under considerable difficulties, and the purpose is to allow the Post Office Department to correct these conditions.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I am sorry that I can not yield.

Mr. WALSH. Then I make the point of order that the gentleman is now discussing the amendment before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. I dislike very much to make a point of order, but the gentleman is a member of this important committee and I would like very much to have whatever information he can give on the pending amendment. I do not think we are interested particularly in the amendments that have been adopted, but the gentleman is a very able member of the committee and I would like to get his opinion upon this.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman from Texas is discussing the extraneous matters that have been brought in by the gentleman from Kentucky and some other gentlemen who have heretofore spoken in this debate.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but this is another day.

Mr. BLACK. I believe that the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to the fact on yesterday that post-office inspectors did not give prior notice that they were coming to inspect a post office in order that the postmaster might get ready for the visit. And it occurred to me that would be a very novel matter to criticize the Postmaster General about.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman appreciates the fact that debate upon this amendment has been limited to a certain time, and I am sure the House would receive valuable information from the gentleman upon the pending amendment.

Mr. BLACK. I did not rise to discuss the pending amendment, and if I am to be held to that—

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BLACK. I thank the gentleman. Now, then, I just want to say a word further in reply to some of these criticisms. I think it is an amazing fact that the Postmaster General has been criticized on the floor of the House during the debate on this bill for conducting the Post Office Department upon a self-sustaining basis. I suppose according to that line of argument that if he had created a deficit he would have been entitled to fine praise. During the five years of his administration it is true that the great department under his able management has paid all of the expenses and has left some surplus. Is that to his discredit? Has the time come when an official of the Government is to be penalized for the use of business efficiency in the conduct of the public business? Indeed, I think not. I think he ought to have the approval and support of the country [applause], because notwithstanding all of the criticism that has been voiced upon the floor of this House by some gentlemen who have spoken and by some labor and postal organizations and that has found its way into some of the newspapers— notwithstanding that, I say without fear of successful contradiction that there has never been a time in the history of this country when the Post Office Department taken as a whole was more efficiently administered than it is to-day. I say this in reply to some of the unfair criticism which we have heard during this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am going to refer to the fact that this House has taken some time for the consideration of this bill, as did my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. Cox], for whose zeal, earnestness, and ability I have the very highest respect; but I want to refer to the time taken in order to compliment the House that while we have been doing a just and good thing, we have done it deliberately, thoughtfully, carefully. We have not done it hastily. We have not done it in a way to be criticized at all. Now, gentlemen, I want to come to the question here of the Post Office Department operating motor trucks through the country to market agricultural products and bring back goods from the cities. I live in the county of Niagara, one of the greatest producing counties in the United States. We raise in profusion practically everything that can grow in the temperate zone. We raise fruits of all kinds, we raise vegetables, we raise every kind of grain, and we have had practical experience with this question of marketing our products by motor truck. So I speak not from theory, I speak not of what can be done, but I speak of that which actually has been done in the county of Niagara. We have farmers in my county who raise 40,000 baskets of peaches and 7,000 or 8,000 bushels of apples. Last year, when those peaches were hanging ripe upon the trees—

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will permit, I desire to say the gentleman is somewhat of a farmer himself, and I want to say I visited him last summer, and on one of his farms he had 7,000 baskets of peaches. [Applause.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. When we had last fall our peaches hanging ready for harvest upon the trees, when the cities and villages throughout this Union needed them, when they were of incalculable value, the transportation facilities of all the railroads—and we have three trunk lines in the State of New York, and besides that we have the Erie, the Lackawanna, and the Lehigh running out of Buffalo—those great systems all broke down completely, and we had to use the motor truck and the cold-storage warehouses. So I say to you, gentlemen, that, although we did it haphazard—because it was haphazard as we organized it in our need—yet it proved a great relief. What we did haphazardly will prove of great and incalculable value when done as you propose to do it here—systematically, day by day, upon a schedule. It will do more than simply relieve congestion. It will, so far as the railroads are concerned, relieve them of transportation to the near-by centers and supply them by the motor-truck lines. And you will supply them in this way. You will supply them better than the railroad will supply them in two or three ways. First, you will supply them in the knowledge from day to day of what their needs will be. You

will supply them more certainly, because the motor trucks will reach the market when the car may be sidetracked somewhere and stay until the fruit is decayed. Again, when it reaches the market it will be delivered exactly where it is needed, and the car has to be sent to certain people, and it may not reach there for two or three days. Then, it will answer another thing. You will find upon every farm each day that there are articles of food which go to waste, and yet the farmer can not afford to transport them, even though they be of great value in the city. If the farmer has vegetables or fruit ripe and ready for market but too small in quantity to pay him to market them, he will gather them and deliver them to the passing motor truck, to his own profit and to increase the food supply of his city brother. The use of these trucks will save much food which would otherwise go to waste, and it will encourage and stimulate production. The provision of the bill will prove of great value and usefulness and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I am only going to take a couple of minutes. I have introduced an amendment, and I will ask the Clerk to report it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1 of Senate bill 2718, line 6, after the word "producer," insert the words "in connection with the Parcel Post Delivery System."

Mr. TOWNER. I desire to call the attention of the committee—I have already called the attention of the chairman of the committee—to this amendment, that there is no statement in this first section that connects the provision of the section and the Postal Department at all, and this was only intended for the purpose of showing it was connected with the Parcel Post Delivery System.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman is a good one and ought to be adopted.

Mr. TOWNER. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. May not we have a vote on my amendment now to dispose of it?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 9, strike out the words "at the earliest practical date" and insert in lieu thereof the words "not later than December 10, 1918."

Mr. MOON. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that there is an amendment already pending that has not been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understood the agreement, all amendments were to be sent up and read; but if it is the other way, the Chair will put them now.

Mr. MOON. I did it under the supposition that the 35 minutes for debate had expired.

The CHAIRMAN. There are five minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I have offered requires a report from the Postmaster General not later than the 10th of next December rather than "at the earliest practical date." The purpose of that is so that if this proves to be the wonderful success it is predicted here in putting Uncle Sam into the green-vegetable peddling business, it might be taken into consideration in making up the next annual appropriation bill. I assume from the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] that the Postmaster General, who is to have charge of this \$300,000 experiment, might possibly hail from the great State of Texas. For myself I do not believe that this experiment is going to accomplish the great good that has been prophesied for it. Reading the hearings and seeing the answers to the very adroit questions of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], we find that the department is going to keep a record and issue bulletins of the produce and supplies, and prices to producers and consumers and patrons, and to provide for regularity of service, and so forth. And we will find in the purchase of these ton and half-ton trucks, with their \$1,200 drivers, you will build up a great paternalistic system operating from certain favored localities, which will confer benefits upon comparatively few; and in return they are supposed to cart back to the producer some of the products in the city which the farmer needs. In other words, this single employee will become the man to do the ladies' shopping. When he comes back to the city with a load of produce, he will run around to the department stores and hardware stores and to other places to purchase articles and carry them back to the farm.

Mr. STEENERSON. Are these chauffeurs, or employees, to be under the civil service?

Mr. WALSH. The hearings state that they are not; that they could not be in the beginning. The gentleman, my colleague from Massachusetts, stated that the debate on this bill during the past three days has been very sincere. I agree with him. Some of the most sincere debates in this body, I have noticed, are those which engage the attention of the House in taking money out of the Treasury for the benefit of some particular class of Government employees amongst our constituents by way of increasing their compensation or salary. I am rather inclined to agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] that this is no time for us to be deliberating at length in order to confer authority upon the Postmaster General to experiment and tinker with this motor-truck system, and that this proposed amendment has no place upon this measure which has to do with increasing the salaries and with regarding the post-office employees.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. WALSH. I certainly will.

Mr. MOON. I just rise to say that I think you are mistaken about the gentleman from Indiana making a statement against the bill. He spoke for the bill, I think.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Indiana commented upon the fact that we had been three days in debate.

Mr. MOON. And he commented upon the fact that this was a good section.

Mr. WALSH. I understand this particular section has the approval of the gentleman from Indiana, but he commented upon the fact that we had debated three days upon the increase of salaries of these post-office employees. I trust that the amendment to the section will not be agreed to and that this measure may be confined to simply a reasonable salary increase bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The vote is first on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

Mr. ROBBINS. May we have the amendment read again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read, as follows:

Amend the first paragraph by inserting after the word "Service," line 12, page 2, of the printed amendment, the following: "Provided, That the Postmaster General may use the revenue derived from this experimental motor vehicle truck service to establish and maintain additional motor-truck routes and to provide for the purchase of vehicles and operating expenses thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 87, noes 7.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows.

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 2, line 14, of the printed rule, strike out the words "at the earliest practical date" and insert in lieu thereof the words "not later than December 10, 1918."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 15, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire whether the vote does not have to be taken by the committee on the proposal offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to adopt it as a part of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS] that has been offered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ROBBINS: Page 2, line 6, after the word "of," strike out "any unexpended" and insert the word "the"; and in line 7 strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof "for."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to strike out the section.



The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 92, noes 6.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, deliver and turn over to the Postmaster General from time to time, and without charge therefor, for use in the Postal Service, such aeroplanes and automobiles or parts thereof as may prove to be, or as shall become, unsuitable for the purposes of the War Department; and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to use the same, in his discretion, in the transportation of the mails and to pay the necessary expenses thereof out of the appropriation for inland transportation by steamboat or other power boat or by aeroplanes or star route.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. NORTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. STAFFORD. To make a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the gentleman is too late. The committee is about dividing.

Mr. STAFFORD. There has been no debate on the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct about it. The gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say one word upon this amendment. The language is "the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, deliver disabled aeroplanes used in the war to the Postmaster General, to be used, in his judgment and discretion, for the benefit and carrying on of the war." There is no additional cost, as I understand it, and this service has proved to be a very effective service. While it may not be proper to experiment with the purchase of new machines for the expansion of the service, yet I know of no better use to which the disabled war airplanes can be put than to use them for the Postal Service.

As to the next section, if I may be permitted to refer to it, it fixes 24 cents an ounce as the rate for carrying this sort of mail. The airplane can carry mail five times as fast as a train, and if the rate is fixed as proposed in the bill it is bound to be remunerative.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. DYER. The section provides that the expenses for the upkeep, and so on, shall be charged to the appropriation for inland transportation. Why is that?

Mr. MOON. Because the airplane service would be a branch of inland transportation, and inland transportation for carrying the mail is appropriated for in the Post Office appropriation bill. This bill does not carry a greater appropriation than would be provided for there. It is for an additional service.

Mr. DYER. If any of these automobiles could be obtained, would they be used by the Postmaster General for the extension of the service?

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman refer to airplanes?

Mr. DYER. No. This includes automobiles as well as airplanes. Would the automobiles be used by the Postmaster General for the extension of the service?

Mr. MOON. I imagine they would be.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman give me five minutes?

Mr. MADDEN. That will give the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. ROBBINS. I have an amendment pending.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am heartily in favor of this legislation. The carrying of parcel post and other mail by motor trucks will be a wonderful stimulus to agricultural development in many sections of the country and will in a most material and direct way contribute to the success of the war work of the Nation. I trust that the experiments in the carrying of mail by motor trucks provided for in this bill have been proposed by the Postmaster General with a broad and comprehensive plan in mind for a system of motor-truck mail delivery covering the entire country. I trust that in asking for this legislation at this time from Congress the Postmaster General has done so primarily because its enactment will enable him to put into operation a new system of rural mail collection and delivery which will effectively cooperate and coordinate with the activities of the other departments and branches of the Government to more successfully carry on our part in this war. This legislation has no place here and is entitled to no consideration by the House at this time unless the new system of mail delivery and the experiments it provides for will cooperate and coordinate with and strengthen industries necessary and essential to our successful conduct of the war.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NORTON. No; I am sorry I do not have the time to do so. I am particularly in favor of that the War Department may turn over to the Post Office Department motor trucks and aeroplanes for which the War Department may have no further use. Aeroplanes, in my judgment, are in the future to play a most prominent part in both the industries of war and the industries of peace. Final victory in the present world war will, in my judgment, be with the side that can place well-manned in the air the greatest number of fighting aeroplanes. It was both surprising and depressing to me to read in the press reports yesterday that Gen. Leonard Wood, who has but recently returned from France, stated to the Senate Committee before which he appeared that, at the time he was in France, while the United States had there more than a thousand trained aviators our Government did not have in France one single fighting aeroplane. I wish to criticize no one at this time. I wish to condemn no one at this time for such a condition. This is no time to criticize or condemn. I want to assist in every way within my power to improve these conditions as rapidly as it is humanly possible to do so. I hope and trust that the condition referred to by Gen. Wood will be very soon changed. I have confidence in the genius and patriotism of my countrymen. I have confidence, that soon, very soon, we shall not only have one, but many thousands of American fighting aeroplanes on the western battle front manned with brave, skillful aviators who will carry the Stars and Stripes to victory against the forces of the mad war lords of Germany and Austria-Hungary and their allies. The one thing of most importance in the world to-day is the one thing of paramount importance to every man, to every woman, and to every child in this land of ours, is the winning of this terrible war in which the very fate of democracy, of free institutions of government, yea of Christianity and of modern civilization, is at stake. This war can only be won by us as a united Nation and as a united people dedicated to doing promptly and efficiently whatever will best and most quickly contribute to placing from three to five millions of trained American soldiers, thoroughly well equipped and plentifully supplied with the best munitions and instruments of modern warfare, out on the western battle front in France where the titanic struggle between democracy and military autocracy is being waged.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NORTON. Not just now.

Mr. DYER. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to the amendment.

Mr. NORTON. Well, what is the gentleman's question? I would be delighted to yield to my good friend from Missouri [laughter] if I only had a little more time. The gentleman knows I only have a few minutes time.

Mr. DYER. I withdraw the point of order. I want to ask the gentleman what is the idea of having automobiles or parts of automobiles in this section? What does the Postmaster General desire to use these automobiles for?

Mr. NORTON. I presume he desires to use these automobiles in carrying out this new system of parcel-post delivery by motor trucks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute of his time.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to what I think is an omission made in this bill. In the report of the Postmaster General he refers to the aeroplanes that he wants to use as the ones that are "not necessary" for use in military operations. In this bill the aeroplanes referred to are described as those that are "not suitable" for military purposes. My amendment simply puts in the words "or unnecessary." We all know that there will be a lot of aeroplanes constructed that will be serviceable for war purposes, but after the war is over they will not be needed or "necessary." Let us make the law correspond with the report and request of the Postmaster General, as found on page 40 of his annual report.

The rural motor service is a most important provision. It is not now altogether experimental. In the Annual Report of the Postmaster General, page 40, he states:

On June 30, 1917, 774 motor routes were in operation. It is desirable that existing restrictions be removed and opportunity provided for establishing service by motor vehicle to rural communities.

I have, Mr. Chairman, one of these routes proposed through my district, extending from Pittsburgh, Pa., via Butler, Pa., to Erie, Pa. I am very much in favor of this amendment and hope this House will adopt it. Further discussion of so meritorious a proposition I deem unnecessary.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to inquire what became of the statement of the Post Office Department which the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, said he would ask to have read to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALSH. Why, I submit that it is.

Mr. MOON. I will ask that that statement be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS].

Mr. ROBBINS. Is there any objection to amendment? It is simply to perfect the bill according to the report of the Postmaster General.

Mr. MOON. I do not think there is any serious objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS], which will be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 19 of the printed amendment, after the word "unsuitable," insert the words "or unnecessary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next section of the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. —. That from and after the passage of this act the Postmaster General, in his discretion, may require the payment of postage on mail carried by aeroplane at not exceeding 24 cents per ounce or fraction thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next section of the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. —. That hereafter the balance to the credit of any one person in a postal savings depository, exclusive of accumulated interest, shall not exceed \$3,000. Noninterest-paying deposits shall not be accepted. All laws inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, is an amendment to that amendment in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire recognition on his amendment?

Mr. MOON. The amendment offered to the postal-savings act is for the purpose of securing revenue to the Government of the United States. Before the act was amended about a year ago, the amount which would be deposited by any one depositor in the postal savings bank was limited to \$500. At that time we raised the amount to \$1,000 interest-bearing and \$1,000 non-interest-bearing deposits for any one depositor. The result of that has been to double the deposits, to increase them from \$20,000,000 to \$40,000,000. The Post Office Department informs us that there is now an intense demand by people in the country who are not willing to trust the national banks or State banks, but who will trust the postal savings bank, that they be allowed to deposit money in larger amounts. Hundreds of them are ask-

ing the department to be permitted to deposit \$3,000 or \$4,000. The department thinks, as the House thought in the beginning, that it was wise to place a limitation upon the amount which might be deposited by any one depositor, but the department is now of the opinion that the limit ought to be raised. If we have the success in the future which we have had heretofore, there will be a large increase in the revenue of the Government. The amount of the limitation proposed is now \$3,000. The House understands that the Government collects this money from the depositors and pays 2 per cent interest. The Government loans it out under conditions fixed in the statute at 2½ per cent interest. The revenue derived last year from this source above the expense was \$955,000. The department thinks that if you raise the amount of the deposit to \$3,000 for any one depositor there will be a great increase of revenue to the Government.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman think this will interfere with the sale of Government bonds or that people will put their money into the postal savings banks instead of buying bonds?

Mr. MOON. Oh, no. The people who deposit in the postal savings bank want to put their money where they can get it out readily, without taking the bonds to the market where they can be sold. In my opinion it will not affect the purchase of Government bonds at all.

While I am on my feet I will say that the next paragraph, with reference to the postal savings law, is simply to provide for a small deposit card and for the purchase of 10 adhesive stamps to be placed upon the card, to be held by the depositors and then presented for collection when desired, without any extra accounting system in the department.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MADDEN. I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield for the purpose of allowing the gentleman to offer this motion?

Mr. LOBECK. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, now I offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOBECK: Page 3 of the printed amendment, line 8, after the word "exceed," strike out the figures "\$3,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$10,000."

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], the chairman of the Post Office Committee, has made a very good statement which shows that if a small amount was a good thing for the people of the country who want to deposit their money in postal savings banks, a larger amount would be better. I am in favor of increasing the limit up to \$10,000. And, while this section does not cover this point, I think we ought to increase the number of postal savings banks throughout the country. At the present time there are 7,161 postal savings banks scattered throughout the United States. We have 56,170 money-order post offices in the country, and every money-order post office in the country should become a postal savings station. If the present Postal Savings System has brought a revenue of \$900,000 annually, as stated to-day on this floor, to the Government, the extension of the system by the establishment of a larger number of postal-savings stations will still further increase the revenue.

Mr. MADDEN. The experience of the Post Office Department shows that there ought not to be as many postal savings banks as the gentleman indicates, because the deposits in some of them are so small that the cost of auditing amounts to more than the benefit that is derived.

Mr. LOBECK. Right in the city from which the gentleman comes there ought to be more postal savings stations. Throughout that city there are small banks that are accepting deposits from foreign-speaking people, and, I am told, for future shipments to Europe after this war is over. They, these foreign-language people, deposit with banks that speak their own language. They advertise in their papers that they will receive these deposits and will hold them for the depositors. Before the war came on, a million immigrants a year came to this country and several hundred thousand returned each year. They sent \$300,000,000 of money normally every year in savings to Europe, and to-day there are trust companies in the United States which are advertising to hold this money of foreigners, to be returned when the war is over. Uncle Sam ought to get hold of this money now.



Mr. DYER. Why not buy bonds with it instead of passing this section?

Mr. LOBECK. If we have the money, we can use it.

Mr. DYER. We can not use it for buying bonds.

Mr. LOBECK. We ought to pay 3 per cent, instead of 2, to get these deposits. In every mining industry, in every mechanical industry in this country there are large numbers of foreigners who are making good wages, and they should be encouraged to deposit with our Government and should be given ample conveniences to do so.

Mr. DYER. Does not the gentleman think that a lot of these people would put their money in these postal savings banks at 2 per cent, instead of buying bonds, when they can get 4 per cent if we pass this amendment?

Mr. LOBECK. I would rather they would buy bonds; but they would have to be educated to do so. There are trust companies advertising in this country that they are State and city and Government depositories. They are paying 3 per cent. The foreigners that read that language and do not understand English as they ought to deposit their money with these little or large local banks, when they ought to deposit with the Government. We ought to pay them 3 per cent, instead of 2 per cent, and we ought to get 3½ per cent for our money, instead of 2½ per cent, or the Government make use of it. This whole matter ought to be looked into very thoroughly. We ought to collect and would, if we had enough postal savings banks in this country convenient for the laborers and others to make use of same. We could get \$300,000,000 annually, instead of its being held and saved for shipment abroad. Under the privilege to extend my remarks, I had stated that certain banks or trust companies are advertising that they pay 3 per cent, and the following is a translated copy of an advertisement printed in a European language, and which states this offer. This newspaper I am told has a wide circulation:

[From the Népszava, New York, N. Y., Feb. 16, 1918, p. 3.]

Készülődjünk A Békére.  
Let us prepare for peace.

On February 11 an event of great significance has taken place. The lofty-souled President of the United States delivered an oration rich in ideas of the possibilities of peace. This manifestation of statesmanly wisdom aroused a strong echo all over the world and has carried forward the cause of peace with a great step. Sooner or later this salutary event will have to take place, which will redeem of suffering the peoples bleeding of a thousand wounds.

We do not enter into soothing regarding the time of making peace, but we might say that much, that he acts properly who makes right now the necessary preparations.

As generally known, crowns can not be bought or sold at present, money can not be transmitted to Hungary, and crown deposits can not be placed. But the saved money can very well be sent for deposit to New York, so it shall be at hand at any moment. With the same frankness with which we have till now defended the interests of our clients, we advise them now to place their saved money in their own interest as dollar deposit, bearing interest at 3 per cent, in our mighty bank, where the money—

1. Bears interest from the day of arrival.
2. Is unconditional safety.
3. Is every moment accessible.

We furnish readily more of information and reply to every letter immediately.

TRANSATLANTIC TRUST CO.  
67 William Street, New York.

Clients in New York and vicinity may personally apply to our East Side branch, which is open daily during banking hours and on Mondays till 8 p. m.

On February 23, 1918, I had the honor to introduce House bill 10186, which reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10186) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, establishing postal-savings depositories, and acts amendatory thereof, and for other purposes, by extending the usefulness of the Postal Savings System and instituting publicity for securing from the public postal-savings deposits.

Whereas the success of the present war and the prosperity of our Nation after the war depends to a great extent upon our ability to bring into circulation savings which are hoarded and intended for export; and

Whereas it has been so far impossible to establish sufficient numbers of United States postal-savings banks, in spite of the fact that this sort of foreign institutions receive in each normal year hundreds of millions of dollars for safe-keeping from our residents; and

Whereas the rate of interest allowed on deposits by our postal-savings banks and required by them for the redeposit of the same from National and State banks is inadequate and in need of proper adjustment; and

Whereas the export of savings interfere with loyalty and the qualification for citizenship; that savings intended for export form a reserve fund for our imperialistic enemies; that savings kept on deposit in this country promote Americanization and thrift, which being a fundamental requirement of stable government and of welfare of citizens and immigrants, it should be encouraged, aided, and assisted in the necessary and practical manner; and

Whereas the masses of wage earners are in need of specific information for taking cognizance of our postal-savings facilities and to counteract the inducements offered to millions of our residents to export and keep on deposit their savings in foreign countries, which are described as the land of opportunities after the war; and

Whereas it is necessary to provide for postal depositories at each and every one of our post offices, to pay a fair rate of interest for such deposits, and acquaint our population of the availability of these governmental depositories: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act approved June 25, 1910, establishing postal-savings depositories, and acts amendatory thereof, and for other purposes, by extending the usefulness of the Postal Savings System and instituting publicity for securing from the public postal-savings deposits, is hereby amended so that it shall read as follows:

SEC. 3. That said board of trustees is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to designate all post offices to be postal-savings depository offices, and each and every post office is hereby declared to be a postal-savings depository office within the meaning of this act and is authorized and required to receive deposits of funds from the public and to account for and dispose of the same, according to the provisions of this act and the regulations made in pursuance thereof. Each postal-savings depository office shall be kept open for the transaction of business during such hours as the Postmaster General, with the approval of the board of trustees, shall direct.

SEC. 2. That section 7 of said act is hereby amended so that it shall read as follows:

SEC. 7. That interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum shall be allowed and entered to the credit of each depositor once in each year, the same to be computed on such basis and under such rules and regulations as the board of trustees may prescribe, but interest shall not be computed or allowed on fractions of a dollar.

SEC. 3. That section 9 of said act is hereby amended so that instead of reading: "and the sums deposited shall bear interest at the rate of not less than 2½ per cent per annum," it shall read: "and the sums deposited shall bear interest at the rate of not less than 3½ per cent per annum."

SEC. 4. That section 10 of said act is hereby amended so that instead of reading: "which bonds shall bear interest at the rate of 2½ per cent per annum," it shall read: "which bonds shall bear interest at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum."

SEC. 5. That section 14 of said act is hereby amended so that it shall read as follows:

SEC. 14. That the sum of \$500,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to enable the Postmaster General and the board of trustees to establish the postal-savings depositories in all post offices in accordance with the provisions of this act, including the reimbursement of the Secretary of the Treasury for expenses incident to the preparation, issue, and registration of the bonds authorized in this act; and the Postmaster General is authorized to require postmasters and other postal officers and employees to transact, in connection with their other duties, such postal-savings depository business as may be necessary; and he is also authorized to make, and with the approval of the board of trustees to promulgate, and from time to time modify or revoke, subject to the approval of said board, such rules and regulations not in conflict with law, and compile and disseminate specific information for securing from the public postal-savings deposits, as he may deem necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect.

SEC. 6. That all laws or parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

This legislation has for its very purpose the increase of larger and increased deposits with the United States postal savings bank, and I hope the House will act favorably on the same and that the bill or some better bill be enacted into law.

I have read with interest an article in the Daily Financial America of date March 6, by Lajos Steiner, which reads as follows:

[From the Daily Financial America, New York, Mar. 6, 1918.]

#### A DRIVE FOR POSTAL SAVINGS DEPOSITS.

(By Lajos Steiner.)

A campaign should be conducted for securing as postal savings bank deposits those amounts which in normal years are exported from here. For decades before the war over \$300,000,000 have been exported in each normal year by immigrants to their countries of origin. The war made the exportation of this sum impossible for the time being. Immigrants earn higher wages at present than ever before.

The results of such a campaign would improve conditions for more reasons than one. Immigrants would become emancipated from under the yoke of that multitude of concerns which operate at every nook and corner wherever immigrants receive wages, and which concerns solicit and receive for export this sort of savings, sell steamship tickets for remigration, and in the course of plying their trade obstruct the immigrants in becoming Americanized. They keep away the immigrants from our institutions, methods, and ideals so as to be enabled the better to exploit them and to induce them to remigrate. This proceeding is encouraged and facilitated by the agents of the respective European governments, the steamship companies, and their influential and omnipresent votaries.

Foreign-language newspapers derive the largest part of their income from the concerns which advertise for the savings to be exported and the sale of steamship tickets for remigrants. The income of these papers would decrease by the Americanization of immigrants; therefore, they do not promote assimilation, but stimulate the export of savings. These sort of remittances only strengthen the kaisers, and become a total loss to American prosperity.

Systematic work is conducted for having the immigrants stay away from everything American—to have them acquire the habit of exporting their savings; to have them keep their savings on deposit in the postal savings banks of the countries of origin, and in time to purchase tillable land over there. By these influences immigrants were made to believe that they are disliked in this country; that our Government intends to conscript and even to confiscate their savings; that it is impossible for them to reengage in farming successfully in the United States; that after the war Europe will be the land of opportunities; that those who fail to return to Europe immediately after transportation becomes available will be prosecuted and when apprehended court-martialed; that their property will be confiscated and their families dispossessed.

Well-informed men believe that 5,000,000 immigrants will depart from here as soon after peace comes and they can be transported. At present the timid immigrants keep their savings in belts and stockings, they hide it in crevices under the floor, or deposit it for safekeeping with concerns which are to export same when that becomes again possible. Immigrants know that mill and mine will not employ them in old age, and believe that it is best for them to return to Europe after they have accumulated some savings. While everything that can be done is being done for having this proceeding continue, practically nothing is done to effect improvement. This evil should be corrected.

The present time is opportune for remedial action. Corrective work should be commenced without delay. Branches of our postal savings banks should be established and maintained at each and every one of those suburbs, hamlets, railroad shops, mills, mines, and lumber camps where wage earners could avail themselves of these governmental depositories. A campaign should be conducted for soliciting and receiving the deposits of industrial employees. We have some 17,000,000 resident immigrants; all are wage earners, they are diligent, saving, and thrifty. The aggregate of their savings amounts each year to hundreds of millions of dollars. These deposited sums would be redeposited by our postal banks in our national, savings, and other banks, and would augment our national welfare and prosperity. At present these sums are hoarded and really form a reserve fund of enormous amounts for the capitalists. Once immigrants discontinue to export their savings they could be interested in American problems, they would make efforts in time to become United States citizens, and their children would surely be as useful and loyal Americans as the children of the earlier arrivals.

The forces which interdeal in alienating from Americanism our immigrants are at present less efficient than before. Immigrants arrive and depart since the last four years to small extent; therefore they are fitter for Americanization than they have ever been before. The last to arrive is here for about four years and has picked up at least some of our language. Immigrants are now more inclined and qualified to be reached and properly influenced than ever before. At this psychological moment better results could be secured than at any other time. This opportunity should not be neglected. The moral and financial effect of our success would be a disastrous blow to imperialism and a fortunate factor for democracy. The present time is opportune to eliminate the forces which prevent immigrants from becoming Americans.

Let our postal savings banks penetrate those localities where wage earners' savings could be secured for deposit. Branches should be established in out-of-the-way places, at points distant from post offices, in sections reached by rural free delivery, and in those parts of our cities where this sort of people dwell. If necessary, headquarters should be established in offices of employing companies which would be willing to cooperate to the extent of providing such headquarters. Experience proves that immigrants incline quite strongly to make use of postal savings banks. Out of the \$150,000,000 deposited in our postal banks by some 700,000 persons, about 65 per cent are immigrants.

Immigrants trust in governmental institutions. The improvement can be effected, the results could only be beneficial to this country as well as to the depositors. After their savings are kept in this country it will be possible to direct immigrants to our farms and thus increase our food production. Immigrants are land hungry. Just as soon as their savings enable them to do so, they leave industrial employment and reengage in farming. They are good farmers; the lands which they till in Europe are farmed for over 1,000 years and are still productive, because these immigrants know how to till the soil properly and without destroying its fertility. Not only is governmental action called for from the standpoint of humanitarianism, but from the standpoint of our own economic needs of the present and future. The matter involved is a problem no whit less serious than others over which we are concerned because of what the end of the war may mean to us. It is a problem of present as well as future moment, for the agents of foreign governments are utilizing our lack of postal savings facilities to take charge of the funds of resident immigrants to have them sent abroad.

Postal savings bank branches should be established at all those points where wage earners could avail themselves of these governmental depositories, and an aggressive campaign should be conducted to influence the immigrants, by information in the newspapers, by circulars, speeches, and other practical means, to deposit and keep their savings in these Federal banks and make efforts to become good Americans. The present time should be utilized to make a drive for securing postal savings bank deposits.

This subject of increased facilities for the wage earners of this land should be given the most earnest consideration by the Post Office Department as well as Congress at an early date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out that amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, that motion is not in order. The section has not yet been adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. The vote is being taken upon its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule under which these amendments are being considered says that they shall be considered as sections offered in the bill, and under that construction of the rule which has been heretofore acted upon the Chair thinks the motion of the gentleman from Missouri is in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri to strike out the section.

The question was taken.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 2, noes 99.

So the amendment to strike out was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. —. That section 6 of the act approved June 25, 1910, is hereby further amended so that the proviso in said section shall read as follows: "Provided, That in order that smaller amounts may be accumulated for deposit, any person may purchase for 10 cents, from any postal-savings depository, specially prepared adhesive stamps to be known as 'postal-savings stamps,' and attach them to a card which shall be furnished for the purpose. A card with 10 postal savings stamps affixed shall be accepted as a deposit of \$1 either in opening an account or in adding to an existing account, or may be redeemed in cash."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, there is still another section, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Sec. —. The additional compensation granted by the provisions of this bill shall be paid out of the revenues of the Post Office Department. If the revenues of the said department shall be insufficient to meet the appropriations made by this act, a sum equal to such deficiency of the revenue of said department is hereby appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply said deficiencies in the revenues for the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1919, and the sum needed may be advanced to the Post Office Department upon requisition of the Postmaster General."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the section just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BLACK rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BLACK. I want to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLACK. I am going to take only a few moments of the time of the House to discuss some of the financial aspects of this bill as it now stands amended.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can not make that motion until five minutes is consumed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct. The motion is out of order.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, on Friday, after the reading of the first section of the bill, I moved to strike out the reclassification paragraphs of the bill and substitute for it a provision to pay all of the postal clerks, letter carriers, and railway mail clerks 15 per cent per annum increase in compensation where their salaries were \$1,200 or less and 10 per cent per annum increase where their salaries were more than \$1,200 and not in excess of \$1,800. That amendment was not adopted, and in the brief explanation I undertook to make at the time it was offered within the limited time that was then at my disposal I showed from the figures that had been compiled by the Post Office Department that the adoption of my amendment would within the period of four years mean a saving to the Government of at least \$35,000,000.

Now, since I made that motion to amend in the manner that I have just stated other amendments have been placed in the bill which increase still further its annual expenditure \$11,240,000, according to the way I have been able to figure it, and so if this bill is adopted in its present form the first year it will cost about \$40,000,000; the second year it will cost more on account of the automatic promotions; and the third year it will cost still more, and will reach its peak of cost in the fourth year, and will cost the postal revenues at least \$55,000,000 more the fourth year than under present law before the adoption of any salary increases, and therefore when we go into the House from the Committee of the Whole, if I can obtain recognition for that purpose, I will move to recommit the bill with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with an amendment striking out all of sections 1 and 2 of the bill and to substitute language which will give all the rural carriers, postal clerks, letter carriers, railway mail clerks, assistant postmasters, and all other postal employees who receive a salary of \$1,200 or less an increase of 15 per cent per annum, which, in the case of a \$1,200 salary, will be \$180 a year, and to those who receive a salary above \$1,200 and not in excess of \$1,800, my amendment would give an increase in salary of 10 per cent per annum. Mr. Chairman, the motion to recommit will not change the effect of the provision in the bill which increases the compensation to fourth-class postmasters, nor will it have any effect on the provision that gives the Postmaster



General the authority to adjust the compensation paid to star-route carriers, screen-wagon services, and so forth.

Mr. MOON. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say to him that the Post Office Department has recommended that we pass an appropriation of \$12,000,000 to meet the expenses up to the beginning of the next fiscal year and \$48,000,000 for the next fiscal year, so the total amount will be \$60,000,000 for this bill.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I believe that those are the figures which have been compiled by the Post Office Department, but I feel that it is but fair to state that on account of the modification made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] of his amendment here Monday there will be about \$7,200,000 of that amount which has been estimated by the Post Office Department cut off. But notwithstanding this reduction, if the bill goes through as it now stands during the first year undoubtedly it will cost more than \$40,000,000 over present expenditures, and thereafter will cost still more for the second, third, and fourth years, as I have shown.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask, in pursuance of the unanimous consent heretofore granted, to return to section 6 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks that the committee return to section 6 under the agreement heretofore made. The Clerk will report the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That this act shall be in force and effect from and after its passage. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. MOON. Inasmuch as legally that section means nothing, I move to strike it out.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be instructed to number these sections numerically in their proper order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to number the sections consecutively in their proper order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOON. And also to amend the title in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise—

Mr. WALSH. I just want to direct the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee to the fact that the title of a bill is not amended in committee.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman is right about that. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and that the bill be reported to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CARAWAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 9414, had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Madden amendment and also on the Almon amendment, the first Madden amendment making a permanent increase.

The SPEAKER. What is it the gentleman demands?

Mr. BARKLEY. I demand a separate vote on the Madden amendment making this provision permanent law, the first Madden amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I also demand a separate vote on the Almon amendment, increasing the increase to 20 per cent.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the other amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. The vote will be on the first Madden amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the yeas and nays—evidently a sufficient number—

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the word "that" up to and including the word "follows," in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "hereafter the compensation of postal employees shall be as follows."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman's motion is to strike out the amendment, is it?

The SPEAKER. No; he just simply asks for a vote on the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. A vote of "aye" would sustain the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 264, nays 97, not voting 72, as follows:

## YEAS—264.

Anderson	Fairchild, B. L.	La Follette	Rodenberg
Anthony	Fairfield	Langley	Rogers
Ashbrook	Farr	Lea, Cal.	Rose
Austin	Fisher	Leibach	Rowe
Bacharach	Flynn	Leshner	Sabath
Baer	Focht	Linthicum	Sanders, Ind.
Barnhart	Foss	Little	Sanders, N. Y.
Beakes	Francis	Lobeck	Sanford
Beshlin	Frear	London	Saunders, Va.
Bland	Freeman	Longgan	Scott, Iowa
Bowers	French	Longworth	Scott, Mich.
Britten	Fuller, Ill.	Lufkin	Seully
Brodbeck	Fuller, Mass.	Lundeen	Sells
Browne	Gallagher	Lunn	Shallenberger
Browning	Gallivan	McAndrews	Sherwood
Brumbaugh	Gariand	McArthur	Siegel
Burnett	Garrett, Tex.	McCormick	Sinnett
Burroughs	Glynn	McCulloch	Slayden
Butler	Gouwin, N. C.	McFadden	Slemp
Caldwell	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Sloan
Campbell, Kans.	Graham, Ill.	McKinley	Smith, Idaho
Campbell, Pa.	Gray, N. J.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Caraway	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snell
Carew	Greene, Mass.	McLemore	Snook
Carlin	Greene, Vt.	Madden	Snyder
Carter, Mass.	Gregg	Magee	Steele
Cary	Griest	Maher	Steenserson
Chandler, N. Y.	Griffin	Mansfield	Stephens, Nebr.
Chandler, Okla.	Hadley	Mapes	Sterling, Ill.
Clark, Pa.	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Sterling, Pa.
Cleary	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mason	Stiness
Coady	Harrison, Va.	Mays	Strong
Cooper, W. Va.	Haskell	Montague	Sullivan
Cooper, Wis.	Haugen	Moore, Pa.	Swift
Costello	Hawley	Moore, Ind.	Switzer
Crago	Hayden	Morgan	Tague
Cramton	Heaton	Morin	Talbot
Crowder	Helvering	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Curtis, Mich.	Hicks	Neely	Taylor, Colo.
Dale, N. Y.	Hilliard	Nelson	Temple
Dale, Vt.	Hood	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson
Dallinger	Huddleston	Nolan	Tilman
Darlow	Hull, Iowa	Norton	Tilson
Davis	Husted	Oldfield	Timberlake
Delaney	Hutchinson	Oliver, N. Y.	Tinkham
Dempsey	Igoe	Olney	Towner
Denison	Ireland	Osborne	Treadway
Denton	Jacoway	O'Shaunessy	Vare
Dewalt	James	Paige	Vestal
Dill	Johnson, Ky.	Parker, N. J.	Volgt
Dillon	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. Y.	Volstead
Donovan	Jones, Tex.	Peters	Waldow
Doolling	Juul	Phelan	Walton
Doremus	Kearns	Platt	Wason
Dowell	Keating	Polk	Watson, Pa.
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Porter	Weaver
Dupré	Kelly, Pa.	Purnell	Wheeler
Dyer	Kennedy, Iowa	Raker	White, Me.
Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	White, Ohio
Eagle	Key, Ohio	Ramseyer	Wilson, Ill.
Edmonds	Kless, Pa.	Randall	Wingo
Edlitt	King	Rankin	Winslow
Elston	Kinkaid	Reavis	Woods, Iowa
Emerson	Knutson	Reed	Woodyard
Esch	Kraus	Riordan	Young, N. Dak.
Evans	Kreider	Robbins	Zihlman

## NAYS—97.

Alexander	Brand	Connally, Tex.	Drane
Almon	Buchanan	Connolly, Kans.	Ferris
Aswell	Byrnes, S. C.	Cox	Foster
Ayres	Byrns, Tenn.	Crisp	Garner
Bankhead	Candler, Miss.	Decker	Garrett, Tenn.
Barkley	Cannon	Dickinson	Gillett
Bell	Cantrill	Dixon	Glass
Black	Carter, Okla.	Dominick	Gordon
Blanton	Claypool	Doollittle	Hamlin
Booher	Coiller	Doughton	Hardy

Hastings	Oliver, Ala.	Sears	Walsh
Hedlin	Overstreet	Shackelford	Watkins
Helm	Padgett	Shouse	Watson, Va.
Hensley	Park	Sims	Webb
Holland	Quin	Sisson	Welling
Hull, Tenn.	Ragsdale	Small	Welty
Humphreys	Ralney	Stafford	Whaley
Jones, Va.	Rayburn	Steagall	Wilson, La.
Kincheloe	Robinson	Stedman	Wilson, Tex.
Kitchin	Romjue	Stephens, Miss.	Wise
Larsen	Rouse	Stevenson	Wright
Lazaro	Rubey	Sumners	Young, Tex.
Lever	Rucker	Venable	
McKeown	Russell	Vinson	
Moon	Sanders, La.	Walker	

## NOT VOTING—70.

Blackmon	Fordney	Kehoe	Pratt
Borland	Gandy	Kettner	Price
Church	Gard	LaGuardia	Roberts
Clark, Fla.	Good	Lee, Ga.	Rowland
Classon	Goodall	Lenroot	Schall
Cooper, Ohio	Gould	Littlepage	Scott, Pa.
Copley	Graham, Pa.	McClintic	Sherley
Curry, Cal.	Gray, Ala.	Mann	Smith, C. B.
Davidson	Hamill	Meeker	Smith, T. F.
Dent	Harrison, Miss.	Merritt	Sweet
Dies	Hayes	Miller, Minn.	Templeton
Drukker	Helntz	Miller, Wash.	Thomas
Ellsworth	Hersey	Mondell	Van Dyke
Estopinal	Hollingsworth	Mott	Ward
Fairchild, G. W.	Houston	Nicholls, S. C.	Williams
Fess	Howard	Overmyer	Wood, Ind.
Fields	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pou	
Flood	Kahn	Powers	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. GOULD (for Madden amendment) with Mr. BLACKMON (against).

From March 25 to April 15:

Mr. BORLAND with Mr. GOOD.

Until further notice:

Mr. CHURCH with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. HERSEY.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.

Mr. KETTNER with Mr. SWEET.

Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. MEEKER.

Mr. POUL with Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. LITTLEPAGE, is unavoidably detained, and he asked me to say that if he were present he would vote "yea" on this vote.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, did Mr. MEEKER vote?

The SPEAKER. No, sir. He is not recorded.

Mr. DYER. Mr. MEEKER is out of the city. He expected to be back to-day to vote. If he were here, he would vote for the Madden amendment.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The vote will be taken on the Almon amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky demands the yeas and nays. All in favor of the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Forty-eight gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. STAFFORD. The other side.

Mr. COX. The other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The other side will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Two hundred and sixty-one gentlemen have arisen in the negative. Forty-eight is not a sufficient number. The Clerk will report the amendment that is called for, the Almon amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Almon amendment to the Madden amendment: Strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Almon amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. COX. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 232, noes 52.

So the Almon amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the title of the bill amended so as to conform with the text.

The SPEAKER. That comes at the last.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLACK. I am opposed to it as it now stands.

The SPEAKER. If any gentleman is really opposed to the bill and has a motion to recommit, the Chair will recognize him. Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman says he is opposed to the bill as it now stands.

The SPEAKER. Well, he is able to speak for himself.

Mr. BLACK. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The Clerk read as follows:

I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with instruction to that committee to report the same back forthwith with an amendment striking out all beginning with line 3, page 1, down to and including all of line 11, page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That during the balance of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the increased allowance for postal employees in addition to the compensation now received by them shall be as follows:

"SECTION 1. That carriers in the Rural Free Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum, exclusive of mileage allowance and \$24 per mile per annum for each additional mile over 24 miles. That clerks in the first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum and 10 per cent per annum up to and including \$1,800 per annum.

"That railway postal clerks shall receive an increase of 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum and 10 per cent per annum from \$1,200 per annum up to and including \$1,800 per annum: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall authorize the Postmaster General to discontinue promotion of clerks in first and second class post offices or carriers in the City Delivery Service or railway postal clerks from grade to grade under the provisions of the classification acts fixing the compensation of those employed in these branches of the Postal Service.

"SEC. 2. That the increases herein provided for shall apply to assistant postmasters in first and second class post offices, allowances for clerks in third-class post offices, and substitute clerks and carriers, also to all post-office clerks, laborers, watchmen, per diem employees, printers, chauffeurs, janitors in post offices, and all other postal employees whose rate of compensation comes within the limit to which these increases apply."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the demand for the yeas and nays on the previous question or on the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. On the motion to recommit, as the Chair understood. Those in favor of taking the vote to recommit by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixty-one gentlemen have risen.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, one more.

The SPEAKER. Sixty-two.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the Chair has already announced the vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but the gentleman wanted to be counted and came in.

Mr. HUDDLESTON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. To make the point of order that the demand for the yeas and nays before action is taken on the previous question is too early.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been voted.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The Chair did not put the reverse.

The SPEAKER. Oh, yes; he did. There was only one vote against it. Sixty-two gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. GARNER. I make the point that 62 is a sufficient number.

The SPEAKER. Sixty-two is not.

Mr. COX. The other side!

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fifty-seven gentlemen have risen. The yeas and nays are refused.



Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands tellers.

Mr. GARNER. I ask for tellers.

The SPEAKER. You can get tellers if you get enough to vote with you. Those who are in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixty-three gentlemen have risen—a sufficient number—and tellers are ordered. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Black] to act as tellers.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DALLINGER. Is this vote by tellers on the question of whether we shall have a yea-and-nay vote on the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already announced that.

Mr. DALLINGER. Is it on the motion to recommit? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madden] says it is not; that it is on the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The previous question was ordered 15 minutes ago.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 70, noes 245.

The SPEAKER. On this vote the ayes are 70 and the noes are 245. Seventy is enough. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MADDEN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. MADDEN. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the question stated to the House, so that we can tell.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. Those in favor of recommitting this bill with the instructions offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Black] will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 51, nays 311, not voting 69, as follows:

## YEAS—51.

Barkley	Doughton	Howard	Rucker
Black	Ferris	Hull, Tenn.	Sears
Blanton	Fuller, Mass.	Humphreys	Sherley
Boober	Garrett, Tenn.	Kinchelee	Sisson
Buchanan	Garner	Kitchin	Small
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gillett	Lever	Stafford
Candler, Miss.	Glass	Oliver, Ala.	Stragall
Cannon	Gordon	Quin	Stephens, Miss.
Carter, Okla.	Hardy	Ragsdale	Venable
Collier	Heflin	Rainey	Walsh
Connally, Tex.	Helm	Rayburn	Welling
Cox	Hensley	Robinson	Young, Tex.
Dickinson	Holland	Romjue	

## NAYS—311.

Alexander	Cramton	French	Kearns
Almon	Crisp	Fuller, Ill.	Keating
Anthony	Crosser	Gallagher	Kelley, Mich.
Ashbrook	Currie, Mich.	Gallivan	Kelly, Pa.
Aswell	Dale, N. Y.	Garland	Kennedy, Iowa
Austin	Dale, Vt.	Garrett, Tex.	Kennedy, R. I.
Ayres	Dallinger	Glynn	Kettner
Bacharach	Darrow	Godwin, N. C.	Key, Ohio.
Baer	Davis	Goodwin, Ark.	Kliss, Pa.
Bankhead	Decker	Graham, Ill.	Kling
Barnhart	Delaney	Gray, Ala.	Kinkaid
Beakes	Dempsey	Gray, N. J.	Knutson
Bell	Denison	Green, Iowa	Kraus
Beshlin	Dewalt	Greene, Mass.	Kreider
Bland	Dill	Greene, Vt.	La Follette
Bowers	Dillon	Gregg	Langley
Brand	Dixon	Griest	Larsen
Britten	Donnick	Griffin	Lazaro
Brodbeck	Donovan	Hadley	Lee, Cal.
Browne	Doolittle	Hamilton, Mich.	Lee, Ga.
Browning	Doremus	Hamilton, N. Y.	Leibach
Brumbaugh	Dowell	Hamlin	Leshner
Burnett	Drame	Harrison, Va.	Lithicum
Burroughs	Dunn	Haskell	Little
Butler	Dupré	Hastings	Lobeck
Byrnes, S. C.	Dyer	Haugen	London
Campbell, Kans.	Eagan	Hawley	Loneragan
Campbell, Pa.	Eagle	Hayden	Lufkin
Cantrill	Edmonds	Heaton	Lundeen
Caraway	Elliott	Helvering	Lunn
Carew	Elston	Hicks	McAndrews
Carlin	Emerson	Hilliard	McArthur
Carter, Mass.	Esch	Hood	McCormick
Cary	Evans	Huddleston	McCulloch
Chandler, Okla.	Fairchild, B. L.	Hull, Iowa	McFadden
Church	Fairfield	Husted	McKenzie
Clark, Fla.	Farr	Hutchinson	McKeown
Clark, Pa.	Fisher	Igoe	McKinley
Claypool	Flynn	Ireland	McLaughlin, Mich.
Cleary	Focht	Jacoway	McLaughlin, Pa.
Coady	Foss	James	McLemore
Connelly, Kans.	Foster	Johnson, Ky.	Madden
Cooper, W. Va.	Francis	Johnson, Wash.	Magee
Cooper, Wis.	Frear	Jones, Tex.	Maher
Costello	Freeman	Jones, Va.	Mansfield
Crago		Juul	Mapes

Martin	Ramsey	Slayden	Towner
Mason	Ramseyer	Slomp	Treadway
Meeker	Randall	Sloan	Vare
Merritt	Rankin	Smith, Idaho	Vestal
Montague	Reavis	Smith, Mich.	Vinson
Moon	Reed	Snell	Voigt
Moore, Pa.	Riordan	Snook	Volstead
Moore, Ind.	Robbins	Snyder	Waldow
Morgan	Rodenberg	Stedman	Walker
Morin	Rogers	Steele	Walton
Mudd	Rose	Steenerson	Wason
Neely	Rouse	Stephens, Nebr.	Watkins
Nelson	Rowe	Sterling, Ill.	Watson, Pa.
Nichols, Mich.	Rubey	Sterling, Pa.	Watson, Va.
Nolan	Russell	Stevenson	Weaver
Norton	Sabath	Stiness	Welty
Oldfield	Sanders, Ind.	Strong	Whaley
Oliver, N. Y.	Sanders, La.	Sullivan	Wheeler
Olney	Sanders, N. Y.	Sumners	White, Me.
Osborne	Sanford	Sweet	White, Ohio
O'Shaunessy	Saunders, Va.	Swift	Wilson, Ill.
Overstreet	Scott, Iowa	Switzer	Wilson, La.
Padgett	Scott, Mich.	Tague	Wilson, Tex.
Paige	Scully	Talbott	Wingo
Parker, N. J.	Sells	Taylor, Ark.	Winslow
Parker, N. Y.	Shackelford	Taylor, Colo.	Wise
Phelan	Shallenberger	Temple	Woods, Iowa
Platt	Sherwood	Thompson	Woodyard
Polk	Shouse	Tillman	Wright
Porter	Siegel	Tilson	Young, N. Dak.
Purnell	Sims	Timberlake	Zihlman
Raker	Sinnott	Tinkham	

## NOT VOTING—69.

Anderson	Fields	Kehoe	Pratt
Blackmon	Flood	LaGuardia	Price
Borland	Fordney	Lenroot	Roberts
Caldwell	Gandy	Littlepage	Rowland
Chandler, N. Y.	Gard	Longworth	Schall
Classon	Good	McClintic	Scott, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Goodall	Mann	Smith, C. B.
Copley	Gould	Mays	Smith, T. F.
Curry, Cal.	Graham, Pa.	Miller, Minn.	Templeton
Davidson	Hamill	Miller, Wash.	Thomas
Dent	Harrison, Miss.	Mondell	Van Dyke
Denton	Hayes	Mott	Ward
Dies	Helntz	Nicholls, S. C.	Webb
Drukker	Hersey	Overmyer	Williams
Ellsworth	Hollingsworth	Park	Wood, Ind.
Estolina	Houston	Peters	
Fairchild, G. W.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pou	
Fess	Kahn	Powers	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. TEMPLETON.

Mr. DENTON with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. MAYS with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. PARK with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. GOULD.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that my colleague, Mr. LITTLEPAGE, is unavoidably absent. I am authorized to say that if he were present he would vote "nay" on this roll call.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce that my colleague, Mr. DAVIDSON, has been called home by the death of a relative. If he were present, he would vote "yea" on the passage of the bill.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 9, answered "present" 1, not voting 77, as follows:

## YEAS—344.

Alexander	Burroughs	Cooper, Wis.	Doughton
Almon	Butler	Cox	Dowell
Anthony	Byrnes, S. C.	Crago	Drane
Ashbrook	Byrnes, Tenn.	Cramton	Dunn
Austin	Campbell, Kans.	Crisp	Dupré
Ayres	Campbell, Pa.	Crosser	Dyer
Bacharach	Candler, Miss.	Currie, Mich.	Eagan
Baer	Cannon	Dale, N. Y.	Eagle
Bankhead	Cantrill	Dale, Vt.	Edmonds
Barkley	Caraway	Dallinger	Elliott
Barnhart	Carew	Darrow	Elston
Beakes	Carlin	Davis	Emerson
Bell	Carter, Mass.	Decker	Esch
Beshlin	Carter, Okla.	Delaney	Evans
Bland	Cary	Dempsey	Fairchild, B. L.
Blanton	Chandler, Okla.	Denison	Fairfield
Boober	Church	Dewalt	Farr
Bowers	Clark, Fla.	Dickinson	Ferris
Brand	Clark, Pa.	Dill	Fisher
Britten	Claypool	Dillon	Flynn
Brodbeck	Cleary	Dixon	Focht
Browne	Coady	Donnick	Foss
Browning	Collier	Donovan	Foster
Brumbaugh	Connally, Tex.	Dooling	Francis
Burnett	Connolly, Kans.	Doolittle	Frear
	Cooper, W. Va.	Doremus	Freeman

French	Kennedy, Iowa	Oliver, N. Y.	Snell
Fuller, Ill.	Key, Ohio	Olney	Snook
Fuller, Mass.	Kiess, Pa.	Osborne	Snyder
Gallagher	Kincheloe	O'Shaunessy	Stegall
Gallivan	King	Overstreet	Stedman
Garland	Kinkaid	Padgett	Steele
Garrett, Tenn.	Knutson	Paige	Steenerson
Garrett, Tex.	Kraus	Parker, N. J.	Stephens, Miss.
Gillett	Kreider	Parker, N. Y.	Stephens, Nebr.
Glass	La Follette	Phelan	Sterling, Ill.
Glynn	Langley	Platt	Sterling, Pa.
Godwin, N. C.	Larsen	Polk	Stevenson
Goodwin, Ark.	Lazaro	Porter	Stiness
Graham, Ill.	Lee, Cal.	Purnell	Strong
Gray, Ala.	Lee, Ga.	Ragsdale	Sullivan
Gray, N. J.	Leibach	Raker	Sumners
Green, Iowa	Leshner	Ramsey	Sweet
Greene, Mass.	Lever	Ramseyer	Swift
Greene, Vt.	Linthicum	Randall	Switzer
Gregg	Little	Rayburn	Tague
Griest	Lobeck	Reavis	Talbot
Griffin	London	Reed	Taylor, Ark.
Hadley	Loneragan	Riordan	Taylor, Colo.
Hamilton, Mich.	Lufkin	Robbins	Temple
Hamilton, N. Y.	Lundeen	Robinson	Tillman
Hamlin	Lunn	Rodenberg	Tilson
Hardy	McAndrews	Rogers	Timberlake
Harrison, Va.	McArthur	Romjue	Towner
Haskell	McCormick	Rose	Treadway
Hastings	McCulloch	Rouse	Vare
Haugen	McFadden	Rowe	Venable
Hawley	McKenzie	Rubey	Vestal
Hayden	McKeown	Rucker	Vinson
Heaton	McKinley	Russell	Voigt
Heflin	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sabath	Voistead
Helvering	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sanders, Ind.	Waldow
Hensley	McLemore	Sanders, La.	Walker
Hicks	Madden	Sanders, N. Y.	Walton
Hilliard	Magee	Sanford	Wason
Holland	Maher	Saunders, Va.	Watkins
Hood	Mansfield	Scott, Iowa	Watson, Pa.
Howard	Mapes	Scott, Mich.	Watson, Va.
Huddleston	Martin	Scully	Weaver
Hull, Iowa	Mason	Sears	Welling
Hull, Tenn.	Meeker	Sells	Welty
Husted	Merritt	Shackleford	Whaley
Hutchinson	Montague	Shallenberger	Wheeler
Igoe	Moon	Sherwood	White, Ohio
Ireland	Moore, Pa.	Shouse	Wilson, Ill.
Jacoway	Moore, Ind.	Siegel	Wilson, La.
James	Morgan	Sims	Wilson, Tex.
Johnson, Ky.	Morin	Sinnott	Wingo
Johnson, Wash.	Mudd	Sisson	Winslow
Jones, Tex.	Neely	Slayden	Wise
Jones, Va.	Nelson	Slemp	Woods, Iowa
Juul	Nichols, Mich.	Sloan	Woodyard
Kearns	Nolan	Small	Wright
Keating	Norton	Smith, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.
Kelley, Mich.	Oldfield	Smith, Mich.	Young, Tex.
Kelly, Pa.	Oliver, Ala.		Zihman

## NAYS—9.

Black	Helm	Quin	Sherley
Garner	Humphreys	Rainey	Stafford
Gordon			

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Walsh

## NOT VOTING—77.

Anderson	Fields	Kettner	Price
Aswell	Flood	Kitchin	Roberts
Blackmon	Fordney	LaGuardia	Rowland
Borland	Gandy	Lenroot	Schall
Caldwell	Gard	Littlepage	Scott, Pa.
Chandler, N. Y.	Good	Longworth	Smith, C. B.
Classon	Goodall	McClintic	Smith, T. F.
Cooper, Ohio	Gould	Mann	Templeton
Copley	Graham, Pa.	Mays	Thomas
Costello	Hamill	Miller, Minn.	Thompson
Curry, Cal.	Harrison, Miss.	Miller, Wash.	Tinkham
Davidson	Hayes	Mondell	Van Dyke
Dent	Heintz	Mott	Ward
Denton	Hersey	Nicholls, S. C.	Webb
Dies	Hollingsworth	Overmyer	White, Me.
Drukker	Houston	Park	Williams
Ellsworth	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peters	Wood, Ind.
Estopinal	Kahn	Pou	
Fairchild, G. W.	Kehoe	Powers	
Fess	Kennedy, R. I.	Pratt	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. LONGWORTH (for) with Mr. WALSH (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. ASWELL with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. GANDY with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.

Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. HEINTZ.

Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LONGWORTH, and I desire to withdraw my vote of "nay" and answer "present."

The name of Mr. WALSH was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleagues, Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD, Mr. GOULD, Mr. MOTT, Mr. CHANDLER of New York, Mr. WARD, Mr. LA GUARDIA, and Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH are unavoidably absent and desire to have it announced that if they were present they would vote "yea."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. TINKHAM of Massachusetts, and Mr. WHITE of Maine had to leave before this vote was taken and requested me to say that if they were present they would vote "yea."

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. KAHN and Mr. CURRY of California are unavoidably absent and have requested me to state that if they were present they would vote "yea," Mr. CURRY being sick and Mr. KAHN being called away on important business.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleagues, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. FESS, and Mr. COOPER of Ohio are unavoidably absent, and if present would vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the same announcement with respect to my colleague Mr. FORDNEY. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same announcement with respect to my colleague Mr. POWERS, who if he were present would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that if Mr. CALDWELL were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island has been unavoidably called away while this vote was pending, and if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same announcement with respect to my colleague, Mr. LITTLEPAGE. He would vote "yea" if he were present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. MOON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to withhold that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman is going to make a request, I would rather not.

Mr. LEVER. I was about to say to the gentleman that I propose to-morrow morning to move to dispense with Calendar Wednesday for to-morrow.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] moves that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 27, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting an alternative estimate of appropriation for certain employees of the workhouse, District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1919, in lieu of the original estimate for these positions, found on page 902, Book of Estimates for 1919 (H. Doc. No. 997); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Alien Property Custodian, submitting an estimate of appropriation required by the Alien Property Custodian for salaries and expenses of his office for the fiscal year, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 998); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of additional appropriation for quarantine stations, Boston and Cape Charles, United States Public Health Service (H. Doc. No. 999); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate for increases in certain items for the



Public Health Service, over the amounts originally estimated therefor, for 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1000); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PHELAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10890) to authorize national banking associations to establish branches, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 413), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURNETT, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend an act entitled "An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad," approved March 2, 1907, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 414), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEELE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10160) authorizing the several district courts of the United States to appoint official stenographers and prescribing their duties and compensation, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 415), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10153) granting a pension to George Gwynne, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 11046) creating an additional district judge in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 11047) to require the Commissioner of Education to devise methods and promote plans for the elimination of adult illiteracy in the United States; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 11048) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 11049) to amend the first and seventh paragraphs of section 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of April 9, 1906; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 11050) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 11051) granting an increase of pension to William Norman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11052) granting an increase of pension to John A. Sare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11053) granting an increase of pension to Roscoe City; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11054) granting a pension to George A. Eskew; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11055) granting a pension to Nancy Grider; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 11056) granting a pension to J. Forsythe Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 11057) granting an increase of pension to Catherine P. Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 11058) granting an increase of pension to John W. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 11059) granting a pension to Thomas J. Bland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 11060) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mayo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 11061) for the relief of Orrin F. Strickland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11062) granting an increase of pension to Francis C. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 11063) granting an increase of pension to John Brocius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 11064) to reimburse Susan Sanders for expenditures and expenses incurred in prosecuting the intermarried white cases on behalf of the Cherokee Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 11065) granting a pension to David O. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11066) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Michael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 11067) granting an increase of pension to John S. Wray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 11068) for the relief of Rudolph L. Desdunes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11069) for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Brennan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 11070) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Boatman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 11071) granting an increase of pension to William F. Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11072) granting an increase of pension to James T. Chapin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11073) granting an increase of pension to Alphonzo O. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11074) granting an increase of pension to Danford Wyllys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11075) granting an increase of pension to Rhodes J. Colvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11076) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin P. Branch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11077) granting an increase of pension to John H. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 11078) granting a pension to Ellen Arbuckle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 11079) granting a pension to Jay H. Lautzenheiser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11080) granting an increase of pension to Isaac J. Ledbetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11081) granting a pension to Lafayette Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 11082) for the relief of H. B. Rogers; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 11083) granting an increase of pension to James W. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 11084) for the relief of Andrew Burzynski; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolutions of a public meeting at Birdsboro, Pa., and of the men's class, United Presbyterian Church, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, urging an amendment to the Federal Constitution prohibiting polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolution of Troop A, Philadelphia Home Defense Reserves, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), resolutions adopted by the United Irish Societies of Chicago, urging that Ireland be made an independent republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of the members of the Beuf Creek Farm Club, urging that higher prices be fixed on farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), memorial of the St. Louis Furniture Board of Trade, protesting against the passage of House bill 9683; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the advisory committee of the New York State conference of mayors and other city officials,

relative to patents on the Imhoff tanks; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of the Boise Commercial Club, Boise, Idaho, favoring Senate bill 313; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., urging tax exemption for bequests, legacies, and gifts to education, philanthropy, and religion; also a resolution of the Woman's Club, Waupaca, Wis., urging the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of 24 citizens of South Dakota and resolutions of the Americans' Loyalty League, of Huron, S. Dak., protesting against the zone system for second-class postage rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of advisory committee of the New York State conference of mayors and other city officials, relative to the patents on the Imhoff tank; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of the Swedish Evangelical Church of Edgewater, Chicago, Ill., against House bill 5712, for the protection and help of secret societies; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of joint committee of Philadelphia trade bodies favoring retention of the pneumatic-tube postal service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Travelers' Protective Association of America; the Paris Literary Club, of Paris, Ky.; the Thursday Literary Club, of St. Albans, W. Va.; the Travelers' Club, of Newark, N. J.; the Woman's Century Club, of Nampa, Idaho; the Civic Club, of Philadelphia; the Seattle Class Journal Publishers' Association, of Seattle, Wash.; the Delta Shakespeare Club, of Lake Village, Ark.; the Somerset Chautauqua Circle, of Somerset, Ky.; the Missouri Federation of Woman's Clubs; the Massachusetts State Federation of Woman's Clubs; the Monday Club, of Webster Groves, Mo.; the Placerville Shakespeare Club, of Placerville, Cal.; the Granite State Dairymen's Association, of New Hampshire; the Woman's Club of Oregon City, Oreg.; the Woman's Club of Albuquerque, N. Mex.; the Lowell Club, of Boone, Iowa; and the Fortnightly Literary Club, of Indianapolis, Ind., asking the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of American Defense Society, relative to charter of the German-American Alliance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. J. Leinbach, master County Line Grange, No. 1751, of Boone County, Ill., relative to price fixing of farm products and the farm-labor problem; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 2150, to increase the pension of Joseph A. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolutions of the Farm Labor Committee, State Council of Defense, urging methods for increasing the production of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of R. Everette Finnium, of Denver, Colo., praying for the passage of the Knutson bill, providing for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act which increases postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Fortnightly Club, of Indianapolis, Ind., protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frances C. Farnsworth, Mary E. Springsteen, Mrs. Allison Stocker, Martha A. Croxby, Paul Brown, Peter J. Theisen, Mrs. Jesse Onyon, Charlotte V. Harvey, and 111 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Dietrich Bros., Baltimore, Md., favoring the establishment of aero mail service from Washington to New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Heywood Bros. and Wakefield Co., protesting against the passage of House bill 10591, to limit profits on house-furnishings; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Randle Highlands Citizens' Association, in favor of utilization of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal for shipping purposes; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. OLNEY: Petition of druggists of Massachusetts for the enactment of House bill 5531, establishing a pharmaceutical corps in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions signed by many citizens of Massachusetts favoring House bill 5407; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of the Irish Women's Council, of Dublin, Ireland, and the principal cities of this country, asking that Ireland be made an independent republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSE: Memorial of Corp. Lucian D. Woodruff, Jr., Camp No. 64, United Spanish War Veterans, of Johnstown, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill 1736, known as the Key bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of T. H. A. Moores, Rev. P. H. Williams, C. W. Cook, Ernest J. Wright, R. T. Schell, Isaac Peck, representing the Johnstown, Pa., branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, praying that the report of the congressional committee which investigated the St. Louis riots be published; to special committee.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the Livingston County Pomona Grange, N. Y., with 1,470 members, unanimously urging the passage of emergency war prohibition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petitions for war-emergency prohibition as a military necessity, as follows: Highland United Presbyterian Church, Second United Presbyterian Church, Central Presbyterian Church, Mahoning Methodist Episcopal Church, Primitive Methodist Church, Wesley and Simpson Churches, Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Free Methodist Church, First Baptist Church, and First Christian Church, all of New Castle, Pa.; also a petition of the same significance from the Woman's Club, Ellwood City, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 27, 1918.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 26, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

PUBLICATION OF CASUALTY LISTS (S. DOC. NO. 208).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOLCOTT). The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of War in response to a resolution of the 22d instant, giving the reasons of the War Department for withholding places of residence of those whose names appear in the casualty lists. The communication will be printed and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and also ordered printed in the Record.

The communication is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, March 22, 1918.

TO THE PRESIDENT UNITED STATES SENATE

SIR: I am in receipt of Senate resolution under date of March 22, 1918, requesting me, if not inconsistent with the interest of the service, to inform the Senate if an order has been issued by the War Department to the effect that hereafter in publishing the casualty lists of the American Expeditionary Forces now abroad that the names of soldiers only would be given, withholding the announcement of their residence and next of kin; and if so, the reasons for such an order. I would inform you in reply that an order to that effect has been issued by the War Department.

The method pursued by the War Department with reference to information concerning casualties is the following:

First. To place in the hands of the nearest relative or the friend given by the soldier in his emergency address prompt and accurate information concerning the casualty before anything is given to the press.

Second. To prevent any information appearing in the papers which will be of any possible assistance to the German cause.

The old system, which gave the date of the casualty, enabled the Germans to get exactly what effect was produced upon our troops in a raid of that date. The publication of the address of the nearest relative or the emergency address did not give the relative any information which had not already been given to them, but it brought down upon them a swarm of claim agents, who guaranteed that they would obtain from the Government the war-risk insurance which is guaranteed by law to the proper inheritor, and in spite of the fact that the department has in each case advised the nearest relatives that their claims will be adjusted by the Government and that they will be furnished the money that is due them without the interposition of claim agents, numbers of poor people have yielded to the importunities of these claim agents, and are thereby deprived of a portion of what is justly their due. The department has also been informed by the Red Cross that relatives of men who are killed in France were the victims, under the system of giving their addresses publicly, of the most absurd propositions to make money, making their grief an object of exploitation.

The raids which are being conducted along our front are for the purpose of capturing a soldier, if possible, with the object of obtaining from him information about the organization which is opposed to the German lines at that point. With the publication of the address of the nearest relative, the German agents in the United States approach the relatives and obtain from them the very information which Germany is attempting to obtain along our front by attacks on our forces.

In France they publish no casualty lists at all, and the information reaches the relatives from the mayor of the town where the relatives live, who is required to communicate the facts to them verbally.

The matter of a change in our former method of publishing casualty lists was brought up by a cablegram from Gen. Pershing, in which he stated that representatives of the French Government had formally